

“COMMIES AND QUEERS”: NARRATIVES THAT SUPPORTED
THE LAVENDER SCARE

by

HOLLY S. HEATLEY

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

August 2007

Copyright © by Holly S. Heatley 2007

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the guidance and criticism of Dr. Joyce Goldberg. Her sharp eye has proven inestimably valuable in spotting errors in both form and logic and her counsel has motivated me to aspire to a higher standard. Drs. Treviño and Reinhardt provided significant contributions that shaped the final version of this manuscript. The support and encouragement of many members of the History Department faculty and staff were crucial to the completion of this project. In addition, my daughter, Sophia, deserves recognition for supplying me with morale support, the motivation to continue working, and for reminding me to always ask “why?”

July 13, 2007

ABSTRACT

“COMMIES AND QUEERS”: NARRATIVES THAT SUPPORTED THE LAVENDER SCARE

Publication No. _____

Holly S. Heatley, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2007

Supervising Professor: Dr. Joyce Goldberg

In the early 1950s, the perceived threat of communists and homosexuals loomed large over the United States. The U.S. press presented narratives that portrayed communists and homosexuals in remarkably similar language that easily merged. The U.S. public viewed the two groups as equal in status, kind, and objective. The twin menaces reinforced one another and elicited an equivalent response.

These narratives and the perceptions they fostered set the stage for the purge of homosexuals from the federal government known as the Lavender Scare. While the Red Scare and Lavender Scare were originally intertwined, legislators and the federal security apparatus continued to hunt alleged homosexuals into the 1970s. Only in the

1990s did homosexuals feel secure enough to work openly in the federal government. The Lavender Scare took from its victims careers, families, and, sometimes, their lives. However, it also created leaders who challenged the perceptions and regulations that oppressed them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. SEXUAL PSYCHOPATHS ON THE LOOSE.....	7
3. COMMUNISTS ARE AFTER YOUR CHILDREN.....	36
4. FEDERAL FORAYS INTO THE REALM OF THE LASCIVIOUS.....	74
5. THE COMPLEX DIMENSIONS OF THE LAVENDER SCARE	112
6. CONCLUSION.....	138
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	142
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	153

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In February 1950, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy grabbed newspaper headlines when he claimed to have a list of 205 Department employees who were communists.¹ McCarthy quickly expanded his allegations to include sexual subversives as well. His common and easy pairing of “commies and queers” not only served as an effective weapon for the political right to use against opponents, but also played on the implicit understanding that members of both groups posed equivalent threats to U.S. society.²

The print media produced narratives that contributed to the images Americans constructed of communists and homosexuals in the years after the Second World War. U.S. press reports of Soviet and communist behavior on both international and domestic fronts as well as articles generated by a sex crime panic provided the U.S. public with a conceptual framework through which to view both communists and homosexuals. However, both constructions simplified complex realities. In the case of the sex crime panic, the portrayal produced an obvious villain in the form of the sexual psychopath, often a homosexual, that reflected fears about changing norms of gender roles, sexual behavior, and child rearing but did not correspond with an increase in sexual crime.³ In

¹*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950) vol. 96, pt. 2, 1953.

²Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 71.

³Estelle B. Freedman, “‘Uncontrolled Desires’: The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960,” *The Journal of American History* 74 (June 1987), 84-5, 87, 92, 94, 97, 100.

the case of communists, the depiction reduced multifaceted situations to a Manichean assessment based on political ideology.⁴

However different communists and homosexuals might appear on the surface, the dominant narratives attributed to them remarkably similar characteristics and motives. The members of both groups were believed to be cliquish, dishonest, and able to identify one another easily through common speech patterns and interests.⁵ In addition, both groups were portrayed as actively working to indoctrinate children.⁶ Communism was not a legitimate political affiliation. Rather, a communist was a type of person who had given his will to the Communist Party.⁷ Similarly, homosexuality was not a behavior. A homosexual was a type of person who had no control over his sexual desires.⁸ Communists sought to destroy public order through political subversion while homosexuals sought to destroy social order through sexual subversion.

U.S. society treated communists and homosexuals in similar ways. Members of both groups were required to register with legal authorities, barred from entry into the

⁴Melvyn Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 61-63.

⁵U.S. Congress, "Homosexual International," *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (May 1, 1952) 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, vol. 98 pt. 10, A2652-A2654; U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (May 15, 1950) 81st Congress, 2nd Session, vol. 96, pt. 15, A3661; Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The Vital Center* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), 127, 151.

⁶"Harvey Job Matusow," oral history interview by Griffin Fariello, *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995), 102, 103; Harry D. Gideonse, "The Reds Are After Your Child," *The American Magazine*, (July 1948), 19, 20; Estelle B. Freedman, "Uncontrolled Desires," 104.

⁷William M. Wiecek, "The Legal Foundations Domestic Anticommunism: The Background of *Smith v. United States*," *The Supreme Court Review* (2001), 378-407.

⁸Margot Canaday, "Who is a Homosexual?: The Consolidation of Sexual Identities in Mid-Twentieth-Century American Immigration Law," *Law and Social Inquiry* 28 (Spring 2003), 363.

country, and incarcerated.⁹ In the public imagination, homosexuals and communists posed equivalent threats and merited equivalent treatment.

As with the Red Scare, the Lavender Scare involved the purge of alleged homosexuals from the ranks of federal employment, but Congressional preoccupation with homosexual infiltration of government agencies lasted long after charges of communist subversion survived only in far right-wing corners.¹⁰ The Lavender Scare had a devastating effect on many individuals, some of whom lost careers, families, or even committed suicide.¹¹ In addition, it affected the operation of the State Department and the formation of U.S. foreign policy. Historian Robert D. Dean argues that the Lavender Scare left lasting scars on some policymakers who then adopted a persona of exaggerated masculinity that led to the continued escalation of the war in Vietnam even after it was clear that the United States could not prevail.¹²

However, the Lavender Scare also provoked homosexual leaders to challenge the underlying premises of the Lavender Scare and to force changes in the laws and

⁹William R. Tanner and Robert Griffith, "Legislative Politics and 'McCarthyism': The Internal Security Act of 1950," in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis (New York: New Viewpoints, 1947), 174, 178; Philip Jenkins, *Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester In Modern America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 80; Paul W. Tappan, "Sentences for Sex Criminals," *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 42 (September-October 1951), 332; U.S. Senate, "Revision of Immigration and Nationality Laws," Report 1137, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, January 10, 1952, 10; Canaday, "Who is a Homosexual?" 358-359; Alan H. Swanson, "Sexual Psychopath Statutes: Summary and Analyses," *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 51 (July-August 1960), 215-219; Wiecek, "The Legal Foundations Domestic Anticommunism," 375-434.

¹⁰David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 4.

¹¹"Peter Szluk," oral history interview by Griffin Fariello, *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995), 123-4.

¹²Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 242-3.

regulations. As a direct reaction to the Lavender Scare, in 1950 Harry Hay founded the Mattachine Society, the first association in a continuous succession of organizations dedicated to homosexual liberation.¹³ In addition, Franklin Kameny, a scholar with a Ph.D. in astronomy from Harvard and a homosexual, was fired from the federal government in 1957.¹⁴ In addition to challenging his own dismissal through the courts, Kameny, acting as lay counsel, represented other fired federal workers, and confronted the American Psychiatric Association (APA) concerning its classification of homosexuals as “diseased.” By working with other gay liberation activists and the American Civil Liberties Union, Kameny successfully changed federal regulations and APA classifications.¹⁵

This is a study of the cultural context of the Lavender Scare. In particular, it investigates the narratives that conditioned the U.S. public to accept the assertions that homosexuals and communists were connected and, as such, were parallel threats to American society. It focuses on and explores the commonly repeated stories about homosexuals and communists that provided the premises that justified the Lavender Scare. In doing so, this work will supplement the existing scholarship on the topic.

¹³Stuart Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay: Founder of the Modern Gay Movement* (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1990), 132, 135-6.

¹⁴Franklin E. Kameny, “Government v. Gays: Two Sad Stories with Two Happy Endings,” in *Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy, and Civil Rights*, ed. John D’Emilio, William B. Turner, and Urvashi Vaid (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 191.

¹⁵Franklin E. Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” in *The Homosexual Dialectic*, ed. Joseph A. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc, 1972), 185-9; Kameny, “Government v. Gays,” 191-3; Henry L. Minton, *Departing from Deviance: A History of Homosexual Rights and Emancipatory Science in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 242-3.

Robert D. Dean's *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* is concerned primarily with the intersection of class and gender as demonstrated by the Eastern Establishment elites at whom Republican politicians, loudly proclaiming middle-class moral sensibilities, took aim in order to gain political advantage. In addition, he analyzes the ultimate effect the Lavender Scare had on the State Department and the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. K. A. Cuordileone examines the political discourse, especially the changing definition of "liberal" in the context of the Lavender Scare, revealed through political rhetoric, literature, and movies.¹⁶ David K. Johnson explores the federal employee security apparatus and Congressional investigating committees that the Lavender Scare spawned in *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. These works necessarily overlap and differ only in the areas of emphasis, not interpretation.

In 1988, Elaine Tyler May published *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*, a book that proved highly influential in the field of Cold War gender history. May argued that the strategy of Containment, the U.S. foreign policy designed to prevent Soviet expansionism, also applied to sexuality, reflecting the belief that a strong traditional family structure would guard against domestic communist subversion.¹⁷ This study draws on May's work and, through the evidence of the narratives examined, offers more support for her argument.

¹⁶K.A. Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War* (New York: Routledge, 2005).

¹⁷Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 102.

John D’Emilio, Martin Bauml Duberman, and Lillian Faberman are a few of the historians who have begun to add homosexual voices to history.¹⁸ This work seeks to improve the understanding of the origin of cultural perceptions surrounding homosexuals by using discourse analysis. The methodology employed in this study was influenced by academics both within and outside the discipline of history, including Joan Scott, Richard C. Trexler, Susan Jeffords, and Carol Cohn.¹⁹

¹⁸See John D’Emilio, *The World Turned: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke Univ Press, 2002.); Martin Bauml Duberman, *About Time: Exploring the Gay Past* (New York: Gay Presses of New York, 1986.); Lillian Faberman, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America* (New York: Penguin Press, 1991).

¹⁹Joan Scott, “Gender: Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” *The American Historical Review* 91 (December 1986), 1053-1075, Richard C. Trexler, *Sex and Conquest: Gender Violence, Political Order, and the European Conquest of the Americas* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), Susan Jeffords, *The Remasculination of America: Gender and the Vietnam War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), Carol Cohn, “Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War,” in *Gendering Wartalk*, ed. Miriam Cooke and Angela Woolacott (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 227-246.

CHAPTER 2

SEXUAL PSYCHOPATHS ON THE LOOSE

In the years following World War II, a narrative of rampant sexual psychopaths in the United States became a common theme in print media. This narrative was the product of a sex crime panic that was not created by increased incidence of crime. Rather, it was the manifestation of fears about permissible sexual behavior, gender roles, and child rearing that functioned to bring discussion about permissible sexual behavior into the public arena while defining proscribed acts.¹

Many historians confirm that a postwar sex crime panic occurred that involved increased and, in some cases, sensationalistic media attention on incidents of violent sexual attacks on women and children.² Media accounts of these attacks created a narrative in which the postwar years were ones in which sexual violence by strangers against women and children seemed common and an ever-present threat.³ The villain of

¹Estelle B. Freedman, “‘Uncontrolled Desires:’ The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960,” *The Journal of American History* 74 (June 1987), 84-5, 87, 92, 97,100; George Chauncey, Jr., “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” in *True Stories from the American Past*, ed. William Graebner (New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1993), 161, 175; Philip Jenkins, *Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester In Modern America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 66, 71-2.

²Freedman, “Uncontrolled Desires,” 92; Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 160; Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 52. Estelle Freedman pinpoints the years as 1949 to 1955 and George Chauncey, Jr. identifies the years 1947 through 1951 with a peak in the winter of 1949-1950. Philip Jenkins perceives the years of 1945 through 1955 as being notable for a preoccupation with sex crime that peaked 1947 to 1950 and 1953 to 1954.

³Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 160, 161, 175; Freedman, “Uncontrolled Desires,” 92, 94; Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 56.

this narrative, the “sexual psychopath,” was indifferent to social mores or laws, incapable of controlling his sexual impulses, and indifferent about his choice of sexual object.⁴ This image produced a dreaded creature against which American society reacted.⁵

Newspapers and magazines promoted the idea that violent sex crime was on the rise in the United States. In 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), wrote the article “How Safe is Your Daughter?” that appeared in *The American Magazine* in which he proclaimed, “The most rapidly increasing type of crime is that perpetrated by degenerate sex offenders.”⁶ The following year, *The American Mercury* printed Hoover’s assertions that “the FBI records one rape or criminal assault somewhere in the United States every 43 minutes. The national bookings for rape have gone up 62 per cent in the past ten years. Arrests of homosexuals and other types of perverts have gone up by 142 per cent.”⁷ Later the

⁴Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 167-8; Freedman, “Uncontrolled Desires,” 92; Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 58.

⁵Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 162-4, 175; Freedman, “Uncontrolled Desires,” 84; Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 80, 82-3.

⁶J. Edgar Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” *The American Magazine*, July 1947, 32.

⁷Frank C. Waldrop, “Murder as a Sex Practice,” *The American Mercury*, February 1948, 144. As pointed out by Philip Jenkins, the FBI figure for rape combined forced and statutory rape until 1958 and even a major proponent of the psychopathic model of sex crime admitted that the rate of rape for this period was falsely elevated by including consensual, though underage, sex. Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 66. The history of *The American Mercury* as a publication is noteworthy here. Alfred A. Knopf founded the magazine in 1924 and H. L. Mencken served as editor from its inception until 1934, giving the periodical a satirical and libertarian but conservative character. Between 1934 and 1952, ownership and editorship of the magazine changed multiple times but, while the political leaning of the publication moved from right to left and back again with those changes, it remained within the mainstream. In 1952, J. Russell Maguire purchased *The American Mercury*. At that point, the magazine moved to the radical right where it remained until it ceased publication in 1980. As an organ of the radical right, the publication promoted theories of vast communist conspiracies within and without the United States, anti-Semitism, and racism. Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton, ed., *The Conservative Press In Twentieth-Century America*

same year, *The Saturday Evening Post* stated that while the FBI reported almost 6,000 rapes in 1947, the agency estimated that 18,000 actually took place since most rapes went unreported. The author, David G. Wittels, claimed, “Psychiatrists believe the real number is tremendously greater. Dr. William W. Haines[...]believes that only one out of every twenty sex crimes is reported to the authorities.”⁸ Journalists commonly used crime statistics, raw crime data, or estimations, removed from comparisons to the national population, to stress the danger of sex crime.⁹ The inclusion of consensual offenses like pornography, homosexuality, sodomy,¹⁰ and statutory rape, as well as non-contact offenses like indecent exposure and voyeurism under the same heading as rape and sexual homicide compounded the perception of danger as well as signaled the assumption that all of the crimes stemmed from a common etiology.¹¹

Magazine articles regularly described violent attacks that emphasized the vulnerability of women and children to sexual crime. In “How Safe is Your Daughter?” Hoover described an attack on a fifteen-year-old girl by two “maniacs,” one of whom had been convicted previously for attacking women and diagnosed with “rather fully crystallized psychopathic traits.” He went on to list the rape of a twelve-year-old Spinal Meningitis patient by a parolee, the rape and murder of an eleven-year-old by a newly

(Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 243-250; Alan Nourie and Barbara Nourie, ed., *American Mass-Market Magazines* (NY: Greenwood Press, 1990), 13-17.

⁸David G. Wittels, “What Can We Do About Sex Crimes?” *The Saturday Evening Post*, December 11, 1948, 31.

⁹Hoover, “How Safe Is Your Daughter?”; Waldrop, “Murder as a Sex Practice”; Howard Whitman, “Terror in Our Cities” series, *Collier’s*, November 19, 1949-March 3, 1951.

¹⁰Sodomy was a term used to describe multiple homosexual and heterosexual practices considered at that time to be abnormal.

¹¹Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 57-8.

released, twice convicted sex offender as well as other victims of the “in again, out again” parole system.¹² “Murder As a Sex Practice” in *The American Mercury* began with detailed descriptions of the sexual assault and murder of a seven-year-old boy by a twelve and a nine-year-old boy as well as a similar crime committed by a thirteen-year-old girl against a five-year-old girl. The article recounted eight more perpetrators ranging in age from seventeen to thirty, with various criminal careers, and their victims, both male and female children and women.¹³ *Collier’s* “Terror in Our Cities” series often gave staccato descriptions of crimes like a macabre shopping list.¹⁴ These articles gave the impression that sexual crimes against women and children were very common and that sexual criminals began victimizing others at a young age.

The Saturday Evening Post added a decidedly psychiatric dimension to its coverage of the sex crime issue in 1948 with “What Can We Do About Sex Crimes?” The article began with a psychiatrist, Dr. Michael T. Moore, explaining that a psychopathic personality was “unable to censor and control his impulses” and “it was practically inevitable that, under suggestion or in certain sets of circumstances, he would commit some serious crime.” Dr. Moore stated that, “psychopathic personalities can be detected early in life by any psychiatrist,” and the author, David G. Wittels, claimed that “most of these so-called sex killers are psychopathic personalities.”¹⁵ Dr. Moore asserted that the failure of society to make legal provisions to commit those with

¹²Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” 33-4.

¹³Waldrop, “Murder as a Sex Practice,” 144-150.

¹⁴Howard Whitman, “Terror in Our Cities”; *Collier’s* November 19, 1949-March 3, 1951.

Although only one article concentrated fundamentally on sex crime, only two of eleven articles did not mention it at all.

psychopathic personalities to mental institutions before they committed crimes left the blame for their violence on society. The author examined in detail the work, family, criminal, and legal history of George Neill, who had sexually assaulted and murdered his eleven-year-old niece and then recounted the case histories of seven other sexual murderers. Finally, Wittels offered a list of recommendations for dealing with sexual psychopaths. All juvenile offenders should be examined for psychopathy and, if so diagnosed, lifetime treatment “advised by the court” or, essentially, forced into psychiatric care or committed to mental institutions for life. However, since there was no known treatment for psychopathic personalities among the psychiatrists Wittels consulted, segregation was the only way to protect society. Sexual psychopaths who committed sex offenses should be sent to “farm-hospital-prisons” where they would be segregated from society, forced to earn their living, and be castrated.¹⁶

While *The Saturday Evening Post* article concentrated largely on psychiatric solutions to sex crime, “Murder as a Sex Practice” and “How Safe is Your Daughter?” were concerned primarily with describing sex crime directed at children. By emphasizing that some children assaulted other children, Waldrop, the author of “Murder as a Sex Practice,” implicitly concluded that sexually violent behavior began at a young age. Moreover, the violently escalating behavior of the sex criminal would only place the innocent and vulnerable in danger as soon as the legal system released

¹⁵Wittels, “What Can We Do About Sex Crime?” 30-31.

¹⁶Wittels, “What Can We Do About Sex Crime?” 31-69.

them upon an unsuspecting society.¹⁷ FBI Director Hoover, author of “How Safe is Your Daughter?” claimed, “With few exceptions, long before a sex fiend reaches his eventual crime of violence there is ample evidence of his tendencies. It is a tragedy that too often those in a position to do something fail to recognize that their ultimate and final responsibility is the protection of society and not the convenience of the individual.”¹⁸ Hoover criticized criminal sentences he judged too lenient and a parole system he viewed as undercutting criminal sanctions, both of which he blamed for recidivist criminals.¹⁹ Explicitly, both Hoover and Waldrop stated that sex criminals should, for the good of society, be forced to undergo psychiatric evaluation and treatment or, if there was no effective treatment, be isolated.²⁰ Implicit in this concept is the idea that the existing legal apparatus was ill equipped to deal with sex criminals.

For those who believed that some sexual deviants might be harmless, an article published in 1949 in *Time* sought to set them straight. “The sex pervert, whether a homosexual, an exhibitionist, or even a dangerous sadist, is too often regarded as merely a ‘queer’ person who never hurts anyone but himself. Then the mangled form of some victim focuses the public’s attention on the degenerate’s work.” A review essay of the book *The Sexual Criminal* offered excerpts from the book’s author, Dr. J. Paul de River, but also reproduced excerpts from the introduction, written by Eugene D.

¹⁷Waldrop, “Murder as a Sex Practice,” 144-147.

¹⁸Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” 32.

¹⁹Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” 32-34. Hoover also wrote the article “Dangerous Freedom” that appeared in January 1948 in *The American Magazine* in which he criticized parole, probation, and plea agreements among other practices that shortened the length of time criminals served in prison.

²⁰Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” 103; Waldrop, “Murder as a Sex Practice,” 150.

Williams, special assistant attorney general of California. According to Williams, “The sex pervert[...]is just as much a criminal as is the burglar or murder[...]A sterner approach is required if the degenerate is to be properly treated and cured[...]rather than turned out as he is now from the penitentiary, confirmed in his perversion.”²¹ Clearly, anyone who deviated from a strict interpretation of heteronormality was dangerous and the existing legal system not only failed to curb such behavior but actually reinforced it.

Collier's “Terror in Our Cities” series ran from November 1949 through March 1951 and reflected “the atmosphere of the time.”²² Although only one of the eleven articles was specifically about sex crime, eight others discussed it. Howard Whitman, the author of the series, claimed that in Detroit “The number of molestations, rapes, gang rapes, homosexual maraudings, abuses of children, and psychopathic episodes which police carry as ‘indecent liberties’ is to the outside observer shocking and ominous.” Women in the city were “virtually curfewed by their own fear.”²³ In Philadelphia, “nine out of ten women...said they were afraid to walk on the streets after dark.”²⁴ “In alarming numbers the little ones [of St. Louis] were becoming hunted game, stalked by the molester, the sex psychopath, and the despoiler.”²⁵ “What kind of a town is this, that a little girl can’t ride her bike in the park [in Washington D.C.] on a bright, sunshiny Sunday without having her throat cut by maniacs?...a woman can’t

²¹*Time*, “Queer People”, October 10, 1949, 52, 54.

²²Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 52.

²³Howard Whitman, “Terror in Our Cities No. 1—Detroit,” *Collier's*, November 19, 1949, 14, 15.

²⁴Howard Whitman, “Nobody’s Safe in Philadelphia,” *Collier's*, December 17, 1949, 15.

²⁵Howard Whitman, “The City that Does Something About Sex Crime,” *Collier's*, January 21, 1950, 20.

walk (in the parks) by day free of the fear of rape and murder?”²⁶ As a case study of the major metropolitan areas of the country, the series portrays a preoccupation with violent crime generally and sex crime specifically. As noted by Philip Jenkins, “although Whitman may have been accurately reporting social attitudes, his account of national terror was written during one of the safest eras in American urban history.”²⁷

The notion of a sex crime wave affected not only the public, whose only likely source of information on the subject was mass media, but also permeated academic journals. In an article appearing in *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* in 1949, James M. Reinhardt Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska, and Edward C. Fisher, Municipal Court Judge of Lincoln, Nebraska, claimed that “all the evidence points to a tremendous increase in the number of and seriousness of sex offenses,” citing J. Edgar Hoover’s *The American Magazine* article from 1947. They concluded “that most of them [sex offenders] are driven by uncontrollable impulses that do not respond to customary legal procedures[...]. Reliance upon traditional juridical procedures has taken us nowhere.” In reference to the diagnostic factors of the psychopathic personality, they asserted that, “in most instances he provides a substantial clue by the recidivous nature of his perverted acts” and they reminded readers that,

²⁶Howard Whitman, “Terror in Washington,” *Collier’s*, June 24, 1950, 20.

²⁷Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 53-4. As an example of the relative nature of the term “crime wave,” Jenkins points out that the Los Angeles Grand Jury in 1949 regarded nine unsolved homicides committed since 1945 as a “formidable roster of murdered women.”

“sexualized ‘criminal’ monsters do not begin as monstrosities.”²⁸ In this instance, two “experts” reinforced the messages disseminated by the mass media.

The pair went on to endorse sexual psychopath laws already passed, whereby the offender was committed to a mental institution, sometimes for an indeterminate length of time. They were especially fond of the Minnesota and Washington D.C. laws, where “an individual who is known to exhibit the familiar dangerous tendencies can be examined and put under restraint before he gets very far in his career.” All of those “ancient and valuable safeguards by which the person accused of crime” had traditionally been protected in the United States such as the presumption of innocence and proof beyond a reasonable doubt had no place in the area of sex offenses. According to the authors, those protections “have no more logical place in the investigation of a known or suspected corrupter of the minds and bodies of little children than in the case of the insane person before the insanity board.”²⁹ While their position did not go unchallenged in the pages of that very journal, clearly, Reinhardt and Fisher believed the narrative of sexual psychopaths running rampant through the country preying on the innocent.³⁰

²⁸ James M. Reinhardt and Edward C. Fisher, “The Sexual Psychopath and the Law,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 39 (March-April 1949), 734-736.

²⁹ Reinhardt and Fisher, “The Sexual Psychopath and the Law,” 741-2.

³⁰ For alternative positions on the sexual psychopath laws, see Edwin Sutherland, “The Sexual Psychopath Laws,” *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 40 (January-February 1950), 543-554; Robert C. Bensing, “A Comparative Study of American Sex Statutes,” *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 42 (May-June 1951), 57-72; Paul W. Tappan, “Sentences for Sex Criminals,” *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 42 (September-October 1951), 332-337; Manfred Guttmacher and Henry Weifhofen, “Sex Offenses,” *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 43 (July-August 1952), 153-157; Ferd Paul Mihm, “A Re-Examination of the Validity of Our Sex Psychopath Statutes in the Light of Recent Appeal Cases and Experience,” *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 44 (March-April 1954), 716-736; Alan H. Swanson, “Sexual

Similarly, when the editor of *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* invited readers to comment on an article by psychiatrist Benjamin Karpman in 1953, the widespread acceptance among other “experts” of the dominant narrative promoted by the media was illustrated.³¹ The ten respondents were composed of nine medical doctors, some of which specialized in psychiatry, and one Ph.D. While a few contradicted Karpman’s model of sexual psychopathy—“All practitioners know that every sex offender is indiscriminately considered a potential maniac, whereas the majority of them never committed any act of violence”—most overwhelmingly supported Karpman’s positions and confirmed the narrative disseminated in the media.³² The view that sex offenses were increasing, that sexual deviation resulted from mental illness, and that sex crimes were unlike other crimes in origin and needed different treatment, specifically psychiatric treatment, proved common responses.³³ While medical practitioners generally viewed sex offenders as patients rather than criminals, their comments still revealed a consensus in line with the larger narrative propagated by the media.

Communities around the country sprang into action to fight sexual psychopaths armed with “facts” from magazines and newspapers and “expert” allies. Sociologist

Psychopath Statutes: Summary and Analyses,” *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 51 (July-August 1960), 215-235.

³¹Benjamin Karpman is described in the literature as the foremost proponent of the diagnostic term “psychopath.” See Jenkins, *Moral Panics*, 59-61. On page 61, Jenkins quotes Karpman as saying, “A sexual offense is sexual behavior that offends the particular society in which the offender lives[...]The majority of sexual crimes, but not all, are the result of sexual deviation. The sexually deviated person is commonly known as a sexual psychopath.” Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 167; Freedman, “Response the Sexual Psychopath,” 91.

Edwin Sutherland studied the process by which sexual psychopath laws were passed and noted three key common components. First, the community was inflamed by the publicity surrounding a few serious sex crimes. He noted that crimes against children garnered the most publicity and aroused the most hysteria. Second, community agitation focused on the need for action to prevent sex crime or to punish sex criminals more severely. Community organizations like the Parent-Teacher Association called mass meetings to discuss the issue. Politicians responded by pressing police departments to enforce statutes related to sex more strictly, appropriating money for the treatment of sex criminals, and calling special sessions of the legislature to enact harsher laws against sex crime. Finally, the appointment of a committee to hear expert testimony and make recommendations for new legislation ensured that, when the initial hysteria subsided, the issue would remain visible and continue to move toward the goal of new laws. As Sutherland pointed out, these committees made only a cursory study of the situation in order to respond quickly with recommendations. However, some communities, such as in Massachusetts, were impatient, and enacted legislation even before the committee could return recommendations. Other states, like New Jersey, appointed a committee to study the problem at the same time that they enacted new legislation.³⁴ Clearly, the media figured largely in the instigation of this process while public pressure on politicians assured passage of new laws.

³²“The Sexual Psychopath: A Symposium,” *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 43 (January-February 1953), 604-5.

³³“The Sexual Psychopath,” 592-621.

³⁴Edwin H. Sutherland, “The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws,” *The American Journal of Sociology*, 56 (September 1950), 143-145.

While the pressure for sexual psychopath laws originated out of local community organizing, these laws spread throughout the United States. Between 1947 and 1949, sixteen states and Washington D.C. passed new laws or amended old ones based on the premise that the country was in the grips of a sex crime wave.³⁵ Representative Frank Chelf, Democrat from Kentucky, announced his intention to pursue the adoption of a federal sexual psychopath law in 1950 in order to protect residents in the remaining seventy five percent of states that had not passed such laws. Under Chelf's proposal, sexual attacks against children would be punished by ten to twenty years in prison with provisions for treatment and for life or death sentences if a child were killed during the commission of a sexual attack.³⁶ By 1959, ten more states had passed such laws.³⁷ Most statutes used the term "sexual psychopath" to describe the person under its jurisdiction but the definitions for such a person varied. Generally, the definitions involved the inability to control sexual impulses or propensities to commit sex crimes. While sixteen states required that the accused be convicted of a crime before initiating examinations to determine if he was a sexual psychopath, in seven states the process could begin soon as an individual was charged with a crime.

³⁵Guttmacher and Wiehofen, "Sex Offenses," 154; Ferd Paul Mihm, "Sex Psychopath Statutes," 717, specific states and dates of laws in footnote.

³⁶R.K. Nickle, "Control of Sex Offenses," in CQ Electronic Library, CQ Researcher Online, cqresre1949121500, Originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1949, v. II* (Washington: CQ Press, 1949) <http://library.cqpress.com/cqresearcher/cqresre1949121500> (accessed July 2, 2006).

³⁷Swanson, "Sexual Psychopath Statutes," 215. For a table of sexual psychopath laws in effect in 1959, see pages 228-235.

Five other states did not require a criminal charge at all but merely the accusation that a person was a sexual psychopath to begin proceedings for commitment.³⁸

Similarly, in many states a hearing was part of the process of determining whether an individual was a sexual psychopath. These hearings often allowed the accused the right to have counsel present, present witness and evidence, and bail. However, this varied with only the right to *habeas corpus* as a constant in all states. While in some states, juries decided whether the individual should be committed, in others a judge decided the question at a hearing, and in still other states, judges decided based solely on medical reports without a hearing.³⁹

A sexual psychopath, once committed to an institution, could be released when a review board, a parole board, or the committing court deemed it appropriate based upon reports from the institution. In some states friends, the committed, or other interested parties could petition for review as well. Once released from an institution, the individual could be freed, on probation or parole, or could be returned to court to face sentencing for the original crime. Since commitment was a civil rather than a criminal proceeding and considered therapeutic rather than punitive, double jeopardy was not invoked by committing an individual based on an act and subsequently imprisoning that person for the same act.⁴⁰

The process by which the sexual psychopath laws were passed involved the

³⁸ Swanson, "Sexual Psychopath Statutes," 215-216.

³⁹ Swanson, "Sexual Psychopath Statutes," 216-218.

⁴⁰ Swanson, "Sexual Psychopath Statutes," 218-219.

participation of Americans at many levels of society. The movement toward legislation began with local community groups and moved up to state and even the federal legislature in the case of Washington D.C., encompassing the public, the medical and psychiatric community, law enforcement, and politicians, demonstrating the wide range of Americans who believed the dominant narrative. Moreover, the fact that legislatures often passed these laws with little research into the frequency of violent sexual crime, the integrity of the term “psychopath,” or the practicality of enforcing the laws, or even before committees investigated these issues shows a consensus on the need for these laws or at least nominal agreement in the name of political expediency. While the media may have begun the process, U.S. citizens were enthusiastic consumers who continued to buy and read articles about sexual psychopaths and who were eager to believe in a narrative of rampant sexual psychopaths as they pushed for sexual psychopath laws.

For all the publicity and support they received, sexual psychopath laws were seldom used. Only a few hundred psychopaths were committed each year across the country throughout the 1950s.⁴¹ Sutherland suggested many possible reasons that the laws fell into disuse. One possibility was that passage of the law itself satisfied the public demand for action and received little scrutiny afterward.⁴² In addition, most legislatures did not fund treatment centers and, with state mental hospitals already

⁴¹Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 88; Edwin H. Sutherland, “The Sexual Psychopath Laws,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 40 (January-February 1950), 553.

⁴²Sutherland, “The Sexual Psychopath Laws,” 553.

filled, there were no facilities to house sexual psychopaths.⁴³ Another possible reason was that prosecutors and judges, as politicians sensitive to public sentiment, often did not regard the individual charged as a patient but rather as a criminal deserving of punishment when faced with serious sex crimes and tended to use the sexual psychopath laws only when the evidence was too weak to secure a guilty verdict. Sutherland received reports that defense attorneys advised their clients to refuse to talk to psychiatrists, thereby making diagnosis impossible but exposing the accused to contempt of court charges.⁴⁴ In addition, the laws became a vehicle of racism, exposing the prevailing view that sex crimes committed by white men were caused by mental illness while sex crimes committed by black men resulted from innate violence. Black men convicted of sex crimes were more likely to be sentenced to prison or death while white men were more likely to be sent to mental institutions.⁴⁵ The sexual psychopath laws were more symbolic than functional and, as such, were not often used. They were conceived to fight a crime wave that did not exist and proscribe a constructed fiend.

As noted by Sutherland as well as other academics at the time, these laws were rooted in several assumptions taken directly from the media. Behind passage of this type of legislation was the belief that women and children were in increasingly great danger from sexual deviants who formed a homogeneous group, separate in origin and

⁴³ California was one exception. The state opened Atascadero State Hospital in 1954 specifically to treat sex offenders and, by 1957, had treated 1,414. In whatever mental facility a sexual psychopath might find himself, therapeutic and experimental treatments like castration, sterilization, drugs, electric shock, or psychosurgery were a possibility. Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 88-89.

⁴⁴Sutherland, "The Sexual Psychopath Laws," 553-554.

⁴⁵Freedman, "Response to the Sexual Psychopath," 97-8.

degree of threat from other offenders. Similarly, the assumptions that sexual psychopaths were easily diagnosable in their youth, they would commit increasingly violent crimes, and they were responsible for most sexual offenses propelled the movement for sexual psychopath laws. As Sutherland and others wrote, these assumptions were false.⁴⁶

Quantitative evidence contradicts the notion that the United States was experiencing an increase in violent sexual crime. The arrest rates for sex offenses, including rape, decreased immediately after World War II and only after the sex crime panic began did they hit prewar levels.⁴⁷ The increase in arrest rates after the beginning of the panic may have been more reflective of police activity due to public pressure rather than an actual increase in crime incidence.⁴⁸

Similarly, Sutherland conducted a study in 1950 and his findings contradicted the notions that sex was a common motivation for violent crimes. He found that of 324 reported murdered women and children, rape was suspected or known to be involved in only 5.7 percent. Aside from rape, he found that the remaining “sex offenses” generally were classified as misdemeanors, the majority of which comprised charges against exhibitionists and homosexuals.⁴⁹ Sutherland’s study failed to confirm the image of

⁴⁶Sutherland, “The Sexual Psychopath Laws,” 543-544; Sutherland, “The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws,” 142-143; Tappan, “Sentences for Sex Criminals,” 333-334; Guttmacher and Weihofen, “Sex Offenses,” 154-155.

⁴⁷Freedman, “Response to the Sexual Psychopath,” 97.

⁴⁸Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 66.

⁴⁹Sutherland, “The Sexual Psychopath Laws”, 545-546. He found that calculating statistics to indicate the motivation for or the violence involved in rape too complicated since many forcible rapes were not reported while statutory rape was counted with forcible rape.

hordes of sexual psychopaths roaming the country compulsively ravishing and murdering women and children. Instead, his findings indicated that a low percentage of murders were associated with sex crimes while the majority of arrests for sex crimes involved consensual or non-contact activity.

Also in 1950, Paul Tappan, working for the New Jersey's Commission on the Habitual Sex Offender, released the findings of a study he conducted on convicted sex criminals. He found that only 5 percent of the individuals convicted of sexual offenses had used force or inflicted physical injury. In addition, only 7 percent had been arrested for sexual offenses before.⁵⁰ Like Sutherland's research, Tappan's findings contradicted the messages that sex was often a motivating factor in the murders of women and children. In addition, Tappan's research challenged the view that sex offenders were compulsively driven to commit increasingly escalating crimes.

The term "psychopath" was controversial. Ben Karpman, a prominent proponent of the term, acknowledged that it was vague and that psychiatrists could not agree upon a common definition. The lack of consensus concerning the meaning of "psychopath" negated claims that psychiatrists could diagnose any psychopath easily at an early age. The breadth of interpretation permitted by varying meanings of the term allowed it to be applied to anyone who did not fit societal norms. Similarly, the belief that psychopaths committed escalating offenses allowed non-violent and consensual

⁵⁰Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 69-70.

offenses like homosexuality and transvestitism to be included in the realm of behaviors one would expect from a sexual psychopath.⁵¹

Further, the narrative of rampant sexual psychopaths was not monolithic. On the same day in February 1950, *Time* and *Newsweek* ran short articles discussing Paul Tappan's study and contradicting the dominant narrative more typically disseminated by the media.⁵² Interspersed within the "Terror in Our Cities" series, *Collier's* ran a lengthy article highlighting Tappan's work and the usual misperceptions as well as problems with the sexual psychopath laws.⁵³ Dissenting views were also found in less mainstream publications. *Science Digest* printed an article in 1949 stating that, according to Dr. Alfred Kinsey, 95 percent of all individuals charged with sex offenses had only "departed from custom" rather than inflicted harm upon society or another person.⁵⁴ *Science News Letter* published an article supporting psychiatric treatment rather than incarceration for sex criminals but asserted that the sexual psychopath, as a diagnosis signaling common characteristics or etiology among sex offenders, was false.⁵⁵ While these few articles hardly mitigated the overwhelming number that confirmed the prevailing view, Americans could find an opposing perspective. However, the media, citizens, and politicians continued to push for sexual psychopath laws as the sex crime panic persisted.

⁵¹Jenkins, *Moral Panic*, 60-61.

⁵²*Newsweek*, "Sex Rampage," February 13, 1950, 22; *Time*, "The Unknown Sex Fiend," February 13, 1950, 85.

⁵³Albert Deutsch, "Sober Facts about Sex Crimes," *Collier's*, November 25, 1950, 15-16, 63-64.

⁵⁴*Science Digest*, "Redefining Sex Crimes," October 1949, 39.

⁵⁵*Science News Letter*, "Sexual Psychopath Does Not Exist; Abolish Term," May 6, 1950, 281.

So why did Americans cling to the notion of a sex crime wave and rampant sexual psychopaths roaming the country? As Sutherland acknowledged, sexual assault, particularly involving the murder of children, aroused strong emotional responses, which the media only tended to amplify.⁵⁶ However, since the incidence of these crimes did not, in fact, increase, the sex crime panic cannot be explained by either the nature of the crimes or the nature of the media. Instead, Americans seized upon the apparent threat of sex crimes in the place of other fears that were less easily confronted.

Domestically, Americans faced a number of contentious issues related to family, gender, and sexuality in the postwar years. World War II had reduced social controls by giving young Americans the opportunity to live away from the vigilance of their families or hometowns. By joining the military or relocating to work in the defense industry, men and women, found a freedom previously unavailable to them. While for both sexes this newfound freedom brought increased opportunity for sexual exploration, working women also enjoyed unusual economic independence during the war years. However, with the war's end came pressure to return to the prewar social order.⁵⁷

Since the family was the symbol of social stability, women were encouraged by politicians and the media to leave the labor force and marry. Either voluntarily or through discriminatory employment policies, non-traditionally female jobs held by women during the war years often went to returning veterans. Still, seventy-five

⁵⁶Sutherland, "The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws," 143-144.

⁵⁷Miriam G. Reuman, *American Sexual Character: Sex, Gender, and National Identity in the Kinsey Reports* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 17; John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman, *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), 289; Chauncey, "The Postwar Sex Crime Panic," 176.

percent of the women employed by the defense industry during the war were still working in that sector in 1946 but at severely reduced wages. Similarly, the pink-collar segment of the economy expanded and, while the number of employed women between twenty and twenty-four decreased, the overall number of working women rose.⁵⁸

Working mothers faced difficulty finding childcare. Even during the war when the federal government used public funds to open childcare centers, only 10 percent of the children who needed care were served. Americans generally felt that small children should be cared for by their mothers. When the federally funded childcare centers closed with the war's end, many mothers of young children faced yet another obstacle to remaining in the work force.⁵⁹

While women's earning potential did not challenge the traditional gender power structure, their increased participation in the labor force caused concern about the maintenance of the family structure. During the war, women's economic independence demonstrated their ability to survive without husbands. "Experts" and politicians warned that the social freedoms women derived from improved economic status would lead to promiscuity, moral decline, and the ruin of the family. During the war years, "experts" and the media promoted an image of women, especially single women, as sexually aggressive that was tied to campaigns against venereal disease, promiscuity,

⁵⁸Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 75-76; Chauncey, "The Postwar Sex Crime Panic," 176. For information about working class women's employment and union activism, see Susan M. Hartman, "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years," in *Not June Cleaver*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 84-102.

⁵⁹May, *Homeward Bound*, 68, 76.

and prostitution. However, the view that women's participation in the labor force was a temporary war measure, a position taken by the federal government while recruiting women to work, soothed fears of permanent social restructuring. Although the U.S. government encouraged women to leave their jobs at the war's end in favor of marriage and family, many women chose to continue working and ambivalence concerning women's roles remained even as the decrease in women's wages encouraged dependence on men.⁶⁰

The supervision of children proved a contentious issue. Throughout the war and until the end of the 1950s, mothers, especially those with small children, were told that their primary responsibility and the path to their ultimate fulfillment as women lay in caring for their children at home. Dr. Benjamin Spock joined in the chorus of child rearing experts who discouraged mothers from working, insisting that the benefits young children received from being cared for by their mothers outweighed any material rewards gained by their mother's employment. However, women, including mothers, continued to join the workforce in growing numbers throughout the decade.⁶¹

The sex crime panic tapped into fears about independent women and the care of children. J. Edgar Hoover wrote about attacks on a fifteen-year-old girl who was riding home alone on a bus from a watermelon festival, an eleven-year-old lured to an open

⁶⁰May, *Homeward Bound*, 68-71, 77, 89

⁶¹Jessica Weiss, *To Have and To Hold: Marriage, The Baby Boom, and Social Change* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 56-7; Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, *For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of the Experts' Advice to Women* (New York: Anchor Books, 1978), 246-7; May, *Homeward Bound*, 74.

field, and a seven-year-old lured to a basement.⁶² There were stories of eight-year-olds molested in movie theaters.⁶³ While none of the articles asserted that the mothers of these children were to blame for the crimes, they did portray the world outside the home as a dangerous place for children, further pressuring mothers to stay home in the best interest of their children.⁶⁴

While danger for children in the form of the sexual psychopath lurked outside the home, danger also waited for women who ventured out without the protection of men. Jean Brusco in Pittsburgh was returning home from work when an attacker split her head open and then raped her. A woman was beaten and raped as she left the Library of Congress in Washington D.C. These were just a few of the examples unearthed by Howard Whitman for the “Terror in the Cities” series.⁶⁵ Married women appeared in these articles as victims but only rarely were women who were accompanied by men attacked. When a police captain in Cleveland was asked what he needed most, he replied, “I’ll tell you in one word, M-E-N, men!”⁶⁶ While he was ostensibly referring to policemen, his answer is revealing. Whether by policemen or husbands, women needed male protection. The narrative of rampant sexual psychopaths undercut women’s independence and reinforced polar gender roles.

⁶² Hoover, “How Safe is Your Daughter?” 32-33, 102,

⁶³ Whitman, “The City That Does Something about Sex Crime,” 21.

⁶⁴ Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 176. See Weiss, *To Have and To Hold*, 55, 58-60 for discussion of attitudes related to working mothers and consensus an conflict within postwar Marriages over the division of labor.

⁶⁵ Whitman, “Terror in Washington,” *Collier’s*, 52; Whitman, “They Get Away With Murder in Pittsburgh,” *Collier’s*, September 2, 1950, 14.

⁶⁶ Whitman, “Cleveland’s Thugs Crawl in the Cracks of the Sidewalks,” *Collier’s*, February 25, 1950, 76.

Complicating the perceived need for male protection of women was the fact that mental health professionals expressed fears that combat had mentally and psychologically damaged American men.⁶⁷ Veterans, these professionals concluded, might return extremely violent or weak after their experiences in battle. Their ability to control their sexual aggression was of particular concern.⁶⁸ While journalists rarely described sex-crime perpetrators in such complimentary terms as “veterans” or “ex-GIs,” the biography of rapist and murderer George Neill revealed that he joined the Marines at age sixteen, just a month after Pearl Harbor. While fighting in the Pacific Theater, he twice killed enemy soldiers in hand-to-hand combat and twice suffered psychological breakdowns for which he was ultimately discharged.⁶⁹ The concern about veterans’ mental health reflected the increased prestige and authority of psychiatry due to their wartime use screening recruits that resulted in the law enforcement establishment looking to psychiatrists for help controlling sex crime.⁷⁰

A general apprehension about the character of American men in the postwar period found voice in the non-fiction literature of the day. Books such as *The Lonely Crowd* and *The Man in the Gray Flannel Suit* emphasized the loss of masculine qualities in American men. Middle-class American men were largely employed in white-collar work and no longer engaged in the physical work of manufacturing a tangible product. Working for large bureaucratic companies robbed men of their

⁶⁷Freedman, “Responses to the Sexual Psychopath,” 96.

⁶⁸Reuman, *American Sexual Character*, 57.

⁶⁹Wittels, “What Can We Do About Sex Crimes?” 50-51.

⁷⁰Freedman, “Responses to the Sexual Psychopath,” 96; See Howard Whitman, “The City That Does Something About Sex Crime,” 64.

autonomy while encouraging feminine traits like cooperation and personal relations. The postwar U.S. economy encouraged consumption, long considered a feminine trait. Men were encouraged to yield their old ideas about patriarchal authority in favor of a democratic family model. The changing nature of work, consumption, family, and recreation all created the perception of a feminized mass culture in which men had lost their supremacy. So, while popular magazine articles were asking what had happened to “the old-fashioned man,” social forces were pushing men away from an older model of masculinity.⁷¹

Magazine articles charged parents with protecting their children from sexual psychopaths but they were also to foster an environment that did not create sexual psychopaths. Many articles stressed that parents must teach their children not to talk to strangers and to refuse gifts or rides from strangers in order to avoid the danger of sex crimes. However, throughout the sex panic, a number of articles stressed that sexual psychopaths were not born but created, and usually by bad parenting. The notion that homosexuality was caused by overly indulgent or overly dominant mothers gained popular currency with Philip Wylie’s *A Generation of Vipers*, first published in 1942. In the postwar version of the origins of sexual deviance, fathers had a role also. In conjunction with an overly indulgent mother, was an emotionally or physically distant and overly punitive father. Even worse for the child, though, would be if parents switched these roles resulting not only in bad parenting but also in sending confusing

⁷¹Reuman, *American Sexual Character*,” 61-65.

messages about gender. As one doctor remarked, “I have met very few perverts who come from happy homes.”⁷²

The warnings that bad parenting created sexual psychopaths supported advice from marriage and childrearing experts that encouraged men to abandon the traditionally distant authoritarian patriarch stance and adopt a more democratic family style. Parents should model correct gender behavior for their children through plenty of family togetherness. Furthermore, the experts counseled that a more permissive attitude should be taken toward the discipline of children that would allow them to explore their desires and the world around them with only gentle direction from the parents. But, while experts were advising an egalitarian family model with the male and female displaying oppositional but complimentary qualities, historian Jessica Weiss reports that families in the 1950s often struggled to put those recommendations into action. Conflict between couples arose over authority, responsibilities, and gender roles. Of course, the experts’ advice assumed a two parent, single income family, and, as the articles discussing the prevention of sex crimes stressed, anything that deviated from their prescription threatened to turn children into sexual psychopaths.⁷³

⁷²Charles Harris, “A New Report on Sex Crime,” *Coronet*, October 1947, 7-8; Irma W. Hewlett, “What Shall We Do About Sex Offenders?” *Parents’ Magazine*, August 1950, 38-39, 68-71; Jeree Crowther, “Answer to Sex Fiends,” *The American City*, April 1950, 119; Ralph H. Major, Jr., “New Moral Menace to Our Youth,” *Coronet*, September 1950, 103-108; Dorothy Diamond and Frances Tanenbaum, “To Protect Your Child from Sex Offenders,” *Better Homes and Gardens*, May 1953, 160, 162.

⁷³Weiss, *To Have and To Hold*, 20-21, 39-43; Peter G. Filene, *Him/Her/Self: Gender Identities in Modern America* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 188-190. For information on expert advice on permissive childrearing and the new marriage dynamics, see Ehrenreich and English, *For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of Experts’ Advice to Women*, 235-240, 270-276.

Although Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey and his team had been conducting the research that became *The Sexual Behavior of the Human Male* since the late 1930s, the book debuted to a culture in conflict over gender roles and acceptable sexual behavior. Published in January 1948, the book became an immediate bestseller and brought unprecedented discussions of sex into the public arena. In contrast to the works about other aspects of American life, the Kinsey Report boosted the masculinity of American men, depicting them as sexually virile and active. Among his more sensationalistic revelations, Kinsey reported that 95 percent of American men participated at some point in their lives in sexual activities that were illegal. Similarly, 37 percent of American men had experienced homosexual relations to the point of orgasm at least once.⁷⁴ Clearly, according to Kinsey, the gulf between sexual mores and practice was large. A culture struggling to redefine permissible sexual behavior helped create the image of the sexual psychopath.

However, while behavior in reality did not match U.S. society's codified moral standards, not all illicit behavior was viewed equally. Most consensual, nonprocreative heterosexual acts performed in private, while illegal, were not prosecuted as long as they occurred between married couples. Even heterosexual adultery and fornication generally avoided legal sanction unless there was "evidence of notorious show of public indecency."⁷⁵ U.S. society viewed male sexuality as naturally aggressive. For this

⁷⁴Reuman, *American Sexual Character*, 22, 74,165.

⁷⁵Stanton Wheeler, "Sex Offenses: A Sociological Critique," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 25 (Spring 1960), 258-259.

reason, a rapist who stopped short of murder or mutilation, was characterized as more normal than a homosexual or pedophile and so was less likely to be diagnosed as a psychopath.⁷⁶

Magazine articles consistently characterized homosexuals as a danger to children. This was true even though the majority of publicized cases of sexual attacks on children involved adult males and female children.⁷⁷ However, in September 1950, *Coronet* featured an article entitled “New Moral Menace to Our Youth,” which claimed that, “each year, literally thousands of youngsters of high-school and college age are introduced to unnatural practices by inveterate seducers.” The article quoted Special Assistant Attorney General of California Eugene D. Williams who asserted that, “the homosexual is an inveterate seducer of both sexes[...]he is not content with being a degenerate himself; he must have degenerate companions and is ever seeking younger victims.”⁷⁸ Howard Whitman, author of the “Terror in Our Cities” series for *Collier’s*, describing homosexual men cruising Detroit’s Circus Park wrote, “a hefty six-footer dressed in a flowered shirt was prowling when [officer] West and I strolled through. We watched his antics for half an hour. Other deviates met and paired off, but this fellow stalked and hunted without success. He grew a little panicky. He finally took off at a long stride down Woodward Avenue.” As they followed the man, Whitman continued, “He took up the hunt again—the same sordid cycle of exhibitionism, search

⁷⁶Freedman, “Responses to the Sexual Psychopath,” 102-103.

⁷⁷Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 171.

⁷⁸Major, “New Moral Menace to Our Youth,” 102. A quote from Eugene D. Williams that appeared in “Queer People” in *Time* appears earlier in this chapter.

and enticement. We saw him disappear down the steps of the latrine[...]Suppose he grew more panicky as the night wore on? Suppose he finally snapped up a child?”⁷⁹ Depictions like these of homosexuals as compulsively unable to control their sexual impulses and their disregard for choice of sexual object served to conflate homosexuals with psychopaths.

As gender historian Estelle Freedman argues, the terms “psychopath,” “sex criminal,” and “pervert” were often used interchangeably or as a code for “homosexual.”⁸⁰ Biologist Barbara Ehrenreich argues that the fear of being labeled homosexual kept men in the roles of husbands and providers throughout the 1950s. Images of nude women bolstered *Playboy's* masculine reputation and protected it from portrayal as a homosexual publication even as it criticized marriage and suburbia as male enslavement.⁸¹ The image of the sexual psychopath functioned not only to reinforce heteronormative sexual behavior and traditional gender roles, but also supported the nuclear family.

The concern with homosexuality was not merely a reflection of the changing behavior of heterosexual men and women. Homosexuals themselves became much more visible as a result of World War II.⁸² The war created opportunities for men and women to live in same sex accommodations without raising suspicions as young men

⁷⁹Whitman, “Terror in our Cities No. 1—Detroit,” 14-15.

⁸⁰Freedman, “Responses to the Sexual Psychopath,” 103

⁸¹Barbara Ehrenreich, *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1983), 50-51,103.

⁸²Freedman, “Responses to the Sexual Psychopath,” 103; Chauncey, “The Postwar Sex Crime Panic,” 176-177.

and women moved away from their families and hometown to join the military or to work in the defense industry. These circumstances weakened the inhibition against homosexual behavior for individuals who might never have acted on homosexual feelings. Those who already had embraced a homosexual identity had greater freedom to pursue relationships. In major metropolitan areas all over the nation, a homosexual subculture developed with social networks and nightlife. The end of the war did not mean an end to this subculture for many of these men and women chose to stay in major cities rather than return to their hometowns. However, it was just this subculture that made homosexuals an easy and obvious target as American society debated permissible sexual behavior and proper gender roles.⁸³ Conflating homosexuals and sexual psychopaths functioned to proscribe homosexuality and the sexual freedom of the war years.

The sex crime panic of the postwar years was not caused by an increase in the frequency or intensity of sex crime. Rather, action against the sexual psychopath served as a surrogate for action against changing social norms that Americans found more difficult to combat but many perceived as threatening to the family structure. The discourse about sexual psychopaths provided a forum to discuss the limits of permissible sexual behavior and allowed American society to prevent some behaviors from moving into the realm of social acceptability.

⁸³John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 23-39.

CHAPTER 3

COMMUNISTS ARE AFTER YOUR CHILDREN

At the same time that Americans grappled with the threat of sexual psychopaths run amuck at home, events on the international scene grew tense. From the end of the Second World War through the 1950s, relations between the United States and the Soviet Union became strained. A number of policies and events—the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, the first Soviet atomic blast, the “fall” of China to communism, and the Korean War, as well as the development of American and Soviet hydrogen bombs—underscored the mounting friction between the major world powers and amplified concern in the United States about communism at home and abroad. The narratives that emerged about communism conveyed important concepts to the American public about the beliefs of U.S. officials that underpinned foreign policy. The common perceptions shared by the policymakers and the public functioned to mobilize public opinion behind many foreign policy initiatives. The narratives about communists existed alongside the narratives about sexual psychopaths, mirrored one another, and easily merged.

At the end of the Second World War, the U.S. print media conveyed to Americans the dire conditions of people all over Europe left homeless, hungry, and diseased by the effects of war.¹ In March 1947 President Truman drew the nation’s

¹Jacqueline De Mauduit, “Suffer Little Children,” *Collier’s*, February 2, 1946, 22-23, 75; Louis I. Dublin, “Europe’s Danger Spots,” *The American Magazine*, March 1946, 36, 152-5; Edward Morgan,

attention specifically to Greece and Turkey when he asked congress for \$400,000,000 in military and economic aid for the two countries. The president asserted that, “The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists,” and, “If Greece should fall under the control of an armed minority, the effect upon its neighbor, Turkey, would be immediate and serious.” Truman supported his request by claiming, “The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife.” With the British financial position precarious, the president impressed upon Americans the U.S. role as a world superpower when he declared, “The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.”²

As historian Melvyn Leffler indicates, Truman’s speech was well received by many Americans because he connected U.S. aid to Greece and Turkey with a totalitarian threat. With the memories of the Second World War only a few years old, Americans viewed totalitarian regimes as a real threat to world order and their security. Therefore, the president’s statement, “At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life,” fell upon sympathetic ears.³

Historian John Lewis Gaddis argues that the phrase “two ways of life” was not a reference to communism and capitalism but to totalitarianism and democracy. In fact, the administration purposely made references to totalitarianism rather than communism

“Disease—Shadow Over Europe,” *Collier's*, March 23, 1946, 14, 74-5, 77; Clinton Anderson, “One Hungry World,” *Collier's*, May 18, 1946, 18-9, 45-6.

²CNN Cold War, “Truman Doctrine Speech,”

<http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/03/documents/truman/> (accessed March 17, 2007).

throughout the summer of 1947.⁴ However, by tying the totalitarian threat in Greece to communists, the Truman Doctrine gained the support of a wide array of anti-communists, who, even during the U.S.-Soviet alliance of the war years, had pushed for investigations of domestic communism. The liberals and progressives who viewed with alarm Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe and the possibility of communist subversion at home joined with religious conservatives and segregationists to support the president's initiative.⁵ The Truman Doctrine, like the sexual psychopath laws, enjoyed support from a wide range of Americans.

As Leffler notes, the U.S. press treated the Soviet Union ambivalently immediately following the Second World War. Sometimes the noble ally and sometimes the oppressive aggressor, the Soviet image was malleable. Stories of Soviet domination in Poland and Romania, conflict over Soviet withdrawal from Iran and Manchuria, as well as communist party activities in various European countries became increasingly common. These stories not only recalled the aggression of Axis powers in the prewar years but also prepared Americans to accept a struggle between two opposing ways of life.⁶

³Melvyn Leffler, *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994), 60-1; CNN Cold War, "Truman Doctrine Speech."

⁴John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 65-5.

⁵Leffler, *The Specter of Communism*, 59-60.

⁶Leffler, *The Specter of Communism*, 60-61. For examples of magazine articles that emphasized the hostile nature of the Soviets, see Reuben H. Markham, "Bullies in the Balkans," *Collier's*, September 7, 1946, 18-19, 36, 39; *Collier's*, "We Understand Russia Now," October 19, 1946, 114; W. B. Courtney, "Balkan Follies," *Collier's*, August 9, 1947, 2267, 69-70.

Truman did not view Soviet actions as the source of the communist uprising in Greece.⁷ Joseph Stalin did apparently abide by the “percentages” agreement he struck with Winston Churchill in October 1944 that placed Greece into the Western sphere of influence.⁸ However, the president and U.S. policymakers worried that a victorious, albeit indigenous, communist movement in Greece would bolster the spirits and fortunes of communist forces throughout Europe. The scenario, should the Greek communists succeed, forecast improved chances for communist victories in France and Italy, loss of morale for non-communist parties in northwestern Europe, and increased vulnerability of the U.S. position in North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula.⁹ The Truman administration’s plan to prevent the Eastern Mediterranean countries from “going” communist was linked to fears that Soviet domination in that part of the world would cut off Western access to raw materials, particularly Middle Eastern oil.¹⁰

The Greek Civil War is a controversial chapter in Greek history. Historians remain unable to agree when it began; some argue that the war was fought in three

⁷Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), 143. Some historians conclude that U.S. policymakers saw only the international aspects of the Greek Civil War and were convinced that the Soviets were backing the GDA even though Soviet aid to the fighters was “non-existent” and Stalin was trying to stop the conflict. Lawrence Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece, 1943-1949* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 254-5. Historian Marc Trachtenberg notes that in 1948 Loy Henderson, director of the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, supported sending a small dispatch of troops into Greece as a show of U.S. support for the country so that “the Soviets would back off.” Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement 1945-1963* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 88.

⁸Albert Resis, “The Churchill-Stalin Secret “Percentages” Agreement on the Balkans, Moscow, October 1944,” *The American Historical Review* 83 (April 1973), 371-2, 378, 387; Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 6-7, 33, 254-5; Amikam Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece, 1946-49,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 25 (1990), 490, 496; Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace*, 35.

⁹Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 125-6, 142-3.

¹⁰Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 143; Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 17-22.

distinct rounds beginning in 1943 while others characterize the period from 1943-4 as “internecine resistance feuding” and 1946-9 as the actual civil war.¹¹ The opposing forces can be divided generally into the nationalists, called the Greek National Army (GNA), and the communists, who, in 1946, took the name the Greek Democratic Army (GDA). However, such a crude classification obscures the diverse ethnic and political composition and the motivations of the warring parties. In addition, participants on both sides brought varying degrees of wartime collaboration and resistance.¹² The Greek Civil War was a bloody affair on both sides. However, according to historians Nikos Marantzidis and Giorgos Antoniou, descriptions of the atrocities of the Greek Civil War generally minimize the guilt of those with whom the chronicler sympathizes as well as underestimate the violence that occurred.¹³

However, as complex as the variables were surrounding the Greek Civil War and as difficult as they remain for the historians to disentangle, President Truman viewed the issue in simplistic terms. According to Special Counsel to the President

¹¹Mark Mazower, “Review: Historians at War: Greece, 1940-1950,” *The Historical Journal* 38 (June 1995), 503, 504.

¹²Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece,” 490, 497; Mazower, “Historians at War,” 501-503; Nikos Marantzidis and Giorgos Antoniou, “The Axis Occupation and Civil War: Changing Trends in Greek Historiography, 1941-2002,” *Journal of Peace Research* 41 (2004), 227, 229. See also John S. Koliopoulos, *Plundered Loyalties: World War II and Civil War in Greek West Macedonia* (New York: New York University Press, 1999) which examines the questions of ethnicity, motivation, and the war-time record of the civil war combatants in Greek Macedonia, André Gerolymatos, *Red Acropolis, Black Terror: The Greek Civil War and the Origins of the Soviet-American Rivalry, 1943-1949* (NY: Basic Books, 2004) which deals with the effect of the war on the common Greek citizenry, exposing atrocities and savagery, within the context of the Cold War, and Anastasia N. Karakasidou, *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), a study of ethnicity and national identity in Greek Macedonia.

¹³Marantzidis and Antoniou, “The Axis Occupation and Civil War,” 227.

Clark M. Clifford, “He never got involved in the complexities of the period. He saw it just as clearly as you can see black and white. There were good men and there proved to be bad men; and, by God, he was going to see to it that the men in the white hats prevailed and the men in the black hats did not prevail.”¹⁴ While there was no evidence that the Soviets were backing the GDA or that Truman believed that to be true, the administration produced the Truman Doctrine out of fear of Soviet expansionism. They crafted the rhetoric of Truman Doctrine speech of March 12, 1947 specifically to inform the Soviets that the United States would confront communist expansionism.¹⁵ Clearly, for Truman, who viewed the issue through the prism of the Cold War, the fighters and supporters of the Greek Democratic Army were the “men in the black hats” and served as surrogates for the Soviets.

Efforts by the U.S. media to bring a more nuanced picture of the conflict to the American public met with resistance from the administration. Press pieces critical of the Greek government, controlled by the nationalists due to first British and then U.S. support, were viewed as the result of poor or incomplete coverage or propaganda.¹⁶ The State Department developed materials for journalists, officials pressured authors of unfavorable pieces to change them, and requested that sympathetic reporters be sent to

¹⁴Clark M. Clifford, oral history interview by Jerry N. Hess, Truman Library, www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/clifford.htm (accessed 3-28-2007).

¹⁵Clifford, oral history interview; Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 143; Resis, “The Churchill-Stalin Secret “Percentages” Agreement,” 371-2, 378, 387; Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 6-7, 33, 254-5; Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention,” 490, 496.

¹⁶Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 156-158; Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece,” 490, 494, 495-6.

Greece. However, even after taking these actions, the administration worried that the American public still held the Greek government in low regard.¹⁷

The administration was particularly concerned about the effect on public opinion of the Greek government's policy of imprisoning, exiling, and executing political prisoners. Officials were successful in 1948 at "quashing" a planned *New York Times* series on U.S. support for such policies.¹⁸ However, some pieces did see publication. *Collier's* published "Isle of Exiles" in February 1947 in which the author, Myron Ehrenberg, interviewed a group of political prisoners, men, women, and children, exiled to the Aegean island of Gavdos. According to Ehrenberg, only two of the fifty-seven on the island claimed to be communists while the others were a mix of socialists and democrats. In addition, many of the exiles were "hostages being held in place of escaped political opponents of the Greek government." While Leonidas Stringos, described by Ehrenberg as a communist editor, hoped for help from the United States, none of the male exiles believed they would ever see freedom, claiming that, "We are due for slow extermination. We all fought against the Nazis. Now we are dangerous characters, because we continue to be liberals fighting for democracy." Ehrenberg ended his article with words from an island guard who declared, "These criminals are keeping us here. First chance I get, when they give me the slightest trouble, I'll shoot the lot of them."¹⁹ Clearly, articles like Ehrenberg's that informed Americans about the

¹⁷Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 144-46, 156-158.

¹⁸Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 157.

¹⁹Myron Ehrenberg, "Isle of Exiles," *Collier's* February 22, 1947, 23.

plight of Greek political prisoners and gave them human faces held the potential for undermining the Manichean view of the Greek Civil War upon which Truman depended for maintaining support of the Truman Doctrine.

Members of the administration were sometimes forced to justify the Greek government's treatment of political prisoners to American citizens. In March 1948, Sumner E. Myers, Professor of Mathematics at the University of Michigan, wrote to his senator demanding confirmation or denial that the Greek government had executed two political prisoners originally jailed by the Nazis in 1944. Myers wrote that the news "shocked me when I heard of it and raised serious doubts in my mind concerning our present policy in Greece."²⁰ Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican from Michigan and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, forwarded the inquiry to Charles E. Bohlen, State Department Counselor for a response. Without the names of the two prisoners in which Myers had expressed interest, Bohlen only addressed the executions of eleven Greeks on February 21, 1948. Those executed, Bohlen maintained, had been convicted in 1945 of murdering civilians during the communist uprising of December 1944 and, therefore, had not been political prisoners but criminals guilty of common law crimes. Bohlen claimed that, "Greece is in fact the only nation in

²⁰Sumner E. Myers, Professor of Mathematics, University of Michigan, to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, March 15, 1948; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 3-2348, Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, National Archives Building, College Park, Maryland (hereafter referred to as NARA).

eastern Europe today which, in both its political and judicial life, respects and endeavors to practice democracy as the American people understand it.”²¹

Bohlen wrote that response just days after a State Department report that detailed the executions, imprisonment, and exile of political prisoners. Over the course of a three week period, 300 communists were deported to the island of Yicaiza for “being dangerous to public security.” In addition, the document reported that eleven “bandits” (communist fighters) were sentenced to death with nine quickly executed on Mount Parnes. In Salonika, forty-six more “bandits” received the death penalty, seven received life imprisonment, and 187 received other sentences.²² Clearly, U.S. public support for the Truman Doctrine depended upon the demonization of communists if only to present the Greek government in a favorable light.

It was with an eye on political implications that Dwight P. Griswold, Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece (AMAG), reported to the State Department on March 23, 1948 that Greek communists had begun taking children to neighboring communist satellite countries. According to Griswold, AMAG workers and Greek intelligence had established that thirty children from leftist families in Epirus had been taken to Albania and fifteen children were perhaps abducted from Macedonia. The removal of Greek children confirmed radio broadcasts of Markos Vafiades, commander

²¹Charles E. Bohlen, State Department Counselor, to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, April 1, 1948; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 3-2348, Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, NARA.

²²Karl Rankin, Chief of AMAG, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, March 23, 1948, 12:00 a.m.; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 3-2348, Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, NARA. For more information on the Greek political prisoners during the civil war, see Polymeris Voglis, *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners During the Greek Civil War* (NY: Berghahn Books, 2002).

of the GDA, which Griswold commented, “were proving [to be] unusually effective psychological warfare.” Griswold downplayed the likelihood that the GDA would engage in a large-scale child removal operation speculating that, “We consider [it] likely that Markos will from time to time snatch a few children to support propaganda of mass abductions and continue [to] produce demoralizing result among Greeks.”²³

Griswold devoted the bulk of his communiqué, however, to the Greek government’s response to Markos’ broadcasts. The Greek Queen Frederica responded with arrangements to remove 20,000 Greek children “to places [of] safety.” For this endeavor, she enlisted the Eighth Division of the GNA that had already “collected a number of children.” Griswold reported that AMAG and Joint U.S. Military Advisor and Planning Group officers had warned their Greek counterparts about the “political and psychological danger if Greece forcibly removed children from [their] parents, the danger that children handled en masse would not receive proper care, and the intolerable interference in essential military operations if, as planned, already limited military transportation used for transporting children.” They had urged that the Queen’s initiative “establish voluntary refugee centers.” Griswold requested that the State Department take up the issue with the Greek Ambassador, especially advising against “compulsory evacuations.”²⁴ U.S. officials initially viewed the removal of Greek

²³Dwight Griswold, Chargé D’Affaires, Athens, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, March 23, 1948, 6:00 p.m.; Central Decimal File, 3-2348, Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, NARA.

²⁴Griswold to Marshall, March 23, 1948, 6:00 p.m.

children as a psychological warfare tactic that threatened to expose the Greek government to more negative publicity.

However, as the numbers of children removed under the auspices of the GDA to communist satellite countries mounted, U.S. officials began to see an opportunity to turn the situation to their advantage. Karl Rankin, Chargé d'Affaires in Athens, wrote, “[The] Embassy believes [that the] abduction of children is [a] step which[...]can be turned into useful anti-Communist propaganda.”²⁵ He recommended that the State Department declassify the information it held concerning the numbers of removed children and release it to the press.²⁶ Ambassador Walter Bedell Smith, writing from Moscow, agreed that the United States should “not remain silent.” However, he cautioned that bold announcements on the issue that strayed from denunciations on humanitarian grounds or criticism of the satellite countries for their complicity in the matter exposed the United States to “political counter-propaganda.”²⁷ Clearly, some State Department officials advocated using the removal of Greek children as a tool in the propaganda war against communism.

However, U.S. officials were ultimately restrained from overtly using the issue for propaganda. Secretary of State Marshall displayed skepticism concerning the claim

²⁵Karl Rankin, Chargé D’Affaires, Athens, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, April 3, 1948, 7:00 p.m.; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 4-348, Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, NARA.

²⁶Karl Rankin, Chargé D’Affaires, Athens, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, April 4, 1948, 9:00 p.m.; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 4-448 Records of the State Department, Record Group 59, NARA.

²⁷Walter Bedell Smith, Ambassador, Moscow, to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, April 3, 1948, 9:00 p.m.; Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 4-348, Records of the State Department, NARA.

that the children had been abducted, believing instead that most of them were removed with their parents' consent. Further, he questioned the numbers of children reported as abducted, suspecting that they had been inflated for propaganda purposes.²⁸ The Greek government pressured the United States for support before the United Nations in accusing a "diabolical international conspiracy" of kidnapping their children for the purposes of frightening the Greek people into supporting the GDA, increasing the number of refugees within Greece as the villagers sought safety in the cities, and ultimately to "warp the minds of the kidnapped children of Greece in order that they may become agents in the enslavement of their native land."²⁹ However, Marshall refused. Without evidence connecting the communist satellite nations to the removals, the only party for the United Nations to condemn would be the GDA, which served no purpose. In addition, the satellite nations would be provided a forum in which to charge that the actions of the Greek government had forced the evacuations and to claim that they were performing a "humanitarian act" by sheltering the children. The split between Yugoslav leader Josip Broz Tito and Stalin provided yet another motive to avoid inflammatory accusations since the U.S. State Department sought to cultivate a relationship with Tito rather than alienate him. Marshall instead advised the Greek government to make a plea before the General Assembly calling for the repatriation of

²⁸Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 162; Lars Bærentzen, "The 'Paidomazoma' and the Queen's Camps," in *Studies in the History of the Greek Civil War, 1945-1949*, ed. by Lars Bærentzen, John O. Iatrides, and Ole L. Smith (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1987), 142; Howard Jones, "The Diplomacy of Restraint: The United States' Efforts to Repatriate Greek Children Evacuated During the Civil War of 1946-49," *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 3 (May 1985), 77.

²⁹Jones, "The Diplomacy of Restraint," 79-80.

the children on humanitarian grounds. Marshall chose a route that protected U.S. interests in the region and avoided becoming ensnared in a complex conflict.³⁰

The Greek government followed U.S. advice and brought the matter before the U.N. The charge, originally submitted February 27, 1948, was pressed again on March 28, 1948 when Greek Foreign Minister Constantin Tsaldaris complained to the U.N. General Assembly that the “rebels” had engaged in “mass kidnapping” that “increased in intensity and in horror until there now has been loosed a reign of terror calculatingly cruel as to challenge description.”³¹ Secretary General Trygve Lie assigned the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans (UNSCOB), already at work in the region investigating Greek claims of border conflicts with Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria, the responsibility of investigating Tsaldaris’ allegations.³² In addition, the General Assembly requested in November 1948 that the International Committee of the Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies assist in efforts to repatriate Greek children who were removed from the country.³³

As UNSCOB investigated the Greek Government’s allegations of mass kidnapping, it uncovered conflicting evidence. In June 1948, the committee reported that, although it was unable to estimate the number of children removed, all the sources

³⁰Jones, “The Diplomacy of Restraint,” 80.

³¹United Nations, “Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans,” (Lake Success, NY: United Nations, 1948), 18; A. C. Sedgwick, “Greek Terror Plea To U.N. Is Pressed,” *The New York Times* (Hereafter known as *NYT*), March 29, 1948, 7.

³²Sedgwick, “Greek Terror Plea”; Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention,” 500-1. The creation of UNSCOB in 1946 Marked the first time that the U.N. used article 34 of its charter to establish a fact-finding committee that operated in the area of contention. C.E. Black, “Greece and the United Nations,” *Political Science Quarterly* 63 (December 1948) 551.

examined agreed that Greek children had been removed from northern Greece beginning in January 1948. The committee concluded that some children were taken by force while in other cases the parents consented to their removal under duress. In still others, parents willingly sent their children out of the country because of their political sympathy with the GDA, the poverty and lack of educational opportunity in Greece, and so that their children could escape the war.³⁴ Although UNSCOB continued to gather evidence throughout 1948, it could neither confirm nor deny Greek allegations of mass kidnapping.³⁵ From 1949 until the committee's duties terminated in 1952, UNSCOB called for the repatriation of Greek children who had been removed in accordance with U.N. resolution 193 (III) of November 27, 1948 and reported on the progress of the International Red Cross toward that end.³⁶

The International Red Cross had only limited success repatriating the Greek children. While the Greek Red Cross claimed that communists had taken 28,296 Greek children to Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, the International Red Cross only collected requests for 10,344 children

³³[Red Cross] UN General Assembly (6th Sess: 1951-1952: Paris), 1952, Repatriation of Greek Children, *A/2119 (GAOR, 6th Sess, Suppl. No. 20)*, -1952.

³⁴United Nations, "Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans," June 1948, 30-31. Riki van Boeschoten presents oral history evidence that Greek children sometimes left without their parents' knowledge or consent, further confusing the issues. Riki van Boeschoten, "Impossible Return: Coping With Separation and the Reconstruction of Memory in the Wake of the Civil War," in *After the War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943-1960*, ed. by Mark Mazower (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 132.

³⁵United Nations, "Supplementary Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans," (Paris: United Nations, 1948), 16-7.

³⁶United Nations, "Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans," (Lake Success, NY: United Nations, 1949), 16-7; United Nations, "Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans," (Lake Success, NY: United Nations, 1950), 23-5; "Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans," (Lake Success, NY: United Nations, 1951), 24-25.

from parents or other guardians.³⁷ Initially, it found the Yugoslav, Albanian, Hungarian, Czechoslovak, Polish, Rumanian, and Bulgarian Red Cross Societies to be only minimally cooperative and responsive.³⁸ In addition, disagreements over the authenticity of documents, the legal definition of “child,” and who may claim a child impeded progress.³⁹ By 1952, the International Red Cross had returned 538 children to Greece, all from Yugoslavia but that reflected both the apex of its success on the issue and Tito’s movement toward the West.⁴⁰ Greece soon dropped the issue of repatriation fearing that the returned children would be fanatical Macedonian separatists.⁴¹

As historian Howard Jones argues, U.S. officials did not make statements capitalizing on the removal of the Greek children for propaganda purposes.⁴² However, their relative silence left U.S. journalists with limited sources on the matter. Some U.S. press reports originated from communist sources, often radio broadcasts.⁴³ Most

³⁷United Nations, “Report of the Special Committee on the Balkans,” 1951, 24.

³⁸[Red Cross]UN General Assembly, Repatriation of Greek Children, 3-7.

³⁹[Red Cross] UN General Assembly, Repatriation of Greek Children, 7-14.

⁴⁰Bærentzen, “The ‘Paidomazoma’ and the Queen’s Camps,” 152; *NYT*, “Belgrade Aids U.N. In Greek Child Aim,” April 1, 1948, 4; *NYT*, “Athens, Belgrade Agree in Principle,” May 10, 1950, 4; *NYT*, “Yugoslavia to Send Greek Children Home,” May 10, 1950, 7; *NYT*, “Yugoslavia To Speed Return of Children,” May 14, 1950, 12; *NYT*, “Tito and the Greeks,” May 16, 1950, 27; *NYT*, “The Proceedings In the U.N.,” May 18, 1950, 4; *NYT*, “Athens and Belgrade Exchange Ministers,” May 22, 1950, 6; *NYT*, “Tito Says He’ll Back U.N. Decision In Event of Conflict With Red China,” November 7, 1950, 1; *NYT*, “Athens, Belgrade will Resume Ties,” November 22, 1950, 13; *NYT*, “Soviet Protests To U.N.,” June 28, 1951, 6.

⁴¹Koliopolis, *Plundered Loyalties*, 266.

⁴²Jones, “The Diplomacy of Restraint,” 66.

⁴³*NYT*, “Greek Reds Announce Children’s Transfer,” March 4, 1948; *NYT*, “Action on Greek Children,” March 5, 1948, 5; *NYT*, “Reds’ Seizure of Children Marked,” March 6, 1948, 5; *NYT*, “Rumania Taking Children,” March 7, 1948, 26; *NYT*, “Plan to Move Children Pressed,” March 8, 1948, 4; *NYT*, “Care of Greek Children,” April 4, 1948, 13; *NYT*, “Issue On Greek Children,” April 5, 1948, 2; *NYT*, “Greek Girls Deny Kidnap Reports,” April 11, 1948, 28; *NYT*, “Poland Disputes Athens,” June 10, 1948, 3; *NYT*, “Rebel Chief Denies Greek Kidnappings,” June 23, 1948, 23; *NYT*, “Rumania Keeps Children,” June 27, 1948, 17; *NYT*, Yugoslavia Rebuffs Greece on Children,” June 28, 1948, 3; *NYT*, “Albania Rejects Charge,” June 24, 1948, 3; *NYT*, “Yugoslavs Report Feeding Number of Greek

information originated with individuals associated with “official” sources such as Greek government officials or the Greek Red Cross.⁴⁴ One reason for this may have been that while the Greek government was centrally located in Athens, most of the GDA forces and supporters were in Northern Greece where the heaviest fighting took place.⁴⁵ As historian Lawrence Wittner noted, U.S. officials’ activities to ensure positive publicity for the Greek government were aimed specifically at members of the press.⁴⁶ In this context, the Greek government’s position dominated the U.S. discourse on the removed Greek children.

Greek society was deeply politically polarized after the Nazis pulled out of the country at the end of World War II and without leftist influence in the government after the liberals boycotted national elections in 1946, the Greek government tended toward hyperbole and inflammatory rhetoric on the topic of the removed children.⁴⁷ Such

Children,” October 13, 1948, 6; *NYT*, “Slav’s Speech on Greece,” October 28, 1948, 4; *NYT*, “Sofia Red Cross Replies,” December 14, 1948, 11; *NYT*, “Markos Plan on Children,” December 18, 1948, 7.

⁴⁴*NYT*, “Truman’s Speech Hailed in Greece,” March 13, 1947, 6; *NYT*, “Aid for Greek Children,” March 25, 1947, 4; *NYT*, “Hoover Lays Chaos In Greece to Stalin,” March 26, 1947, 3; *NYT*, “Arms for Civilians in Greece Urged,” December 19, 1947, 8; *NYT*, “Relief Sponsors Sought,” December 22, 1947, 27; *NYT*, “Reds Taking of Children Alleged,” March 2, 1948; *NYT*, “Action on ,” March 5, 1948; *NYT*, “Reds’ Seizure,” March 6, 1948; *NYT*, “Rumania Taking,” March 7, 1948, *NYT*, “Plan to Move,” March 8, 1948, *NYT*, “Rebel Band Caught Near Athens,” March 8, 1948, 4; *NYT*, “Action on,” March 12, 1948; *NYT*, “Big Greek Rebel Band Routed Near Sparta,” March 28, 1948, 24; Sedgwick, “Greek Terrorism Plea,” *NYT*, March 29, 1948; *NYT*, “Care of,” April 4, 1948; *NYT*, “Greek Puts Peace Up To Neighbors,” June 5, 1948, 8; A. C. Sedgwick, “Greece is Spurned on Child Plea,” *NYT*, June 9, 1948, 12; *NYT*, “Greeks Unconvinced On Bulgarian Offer,” June 14, 1948, 6; C.L. Sulzberger, “Abductions by Greek Rebels Spur Vast Child Aid Project,” *NYT*, June 21, 1948, 1, 15; A.C. Sedgwick, “Greeks Continue to Press Rebels,” *NYT*, June 24, 1948, 18; *NYT*, Yugoslavia Rebuffs Greece,” June 28, 1948; A.C. Sedgwick, “Greek Army Saves 500 Grammos Children; Drive on Rebels in Peloponnesus Is Planned,” *NYT*, August 21, 1948, 4; *NYT*, “Child Aid Wins Queen’s Thanks,” August 24, 1948, 17; *NYT*, “Yugoslavs Report,” October 13, 1948; *NYT*, “Greek Child Exiles Numbered at 23,696,” December 3, 1948, 6.

⁴⁵Koliopolis, *Plundered Loyalties*, 255.

⁴⁶Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 156-8.

⁴⁷Nachmani, “Civil War and Foreign Intervention,” 494; Mazower, “Historians at War,” 504.

rhetoric was on display in a number of pamphlets published by the Greek government during its campaign to repatriate the children. In a pamphlet published in 1948, the Greek government termed the removals “kidnappings” that it equated to genocide and Nazi war crimes. The pamphlet reminded readers of the “sacredness of the child” that it claimed was “so universally acknowledged as being the very hall-mark of civilized society.”⁴⁸ A pamphlet published in 1950 by the Greek Embassy in the United States claimed that, “By analogy, if such abductions of minors had taken place in the United States, over half a million American boys and girls would have been wrested from their homes.” The publication referred to the departure of the children as the “Greek Death March” and claimed that the children, indoctrinated with communism, would become adults who, “could be expected to infiltrate back into Greece, seize control, and align the country with the Soviet satellites.”⁴⁹ By using these arguments, the Greek government presented its positions in a way that not only corresponded with the Cold War rhetoric emanating from the Truman White House, but also conflated communist actions with Nazi war crimes. In addition, the Greek government used the “assault” on the bond between parent and child to provoke an emotional response, similar to that produced by violent crimes against children, to engender support for itself and condemnation for the communists.

⁴⁸C.P. Rodocanachi, *Against and For the Greek Child* (Athens: Ministry for Press and Information, 1948), 5-6.

⁴⁹Royal Greek Embassy, *Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive: A Survey of the Case of the Kidnapped Greek Children* (Washington D.C.: Royal Greek Embassy Information Service, 1950), 5, 6, 9-10.

U.S. press accounts largely mirrored the Greek government's position. The first reports of communist abductions filtered into the United States in early March of 1948. The Greek government announced that communist satellite states were plotting the kidnapping of 50,000 Greek children for indoctrination in order to create "blind and fanatical instruments of totalitarian regimes."⁵⁰ Over the following days, weeks, and months, multiple stories appeared charging communist guerillas with mass kidnappings of children as young as three.⁵¹ While the receiving countries of Yugoslavia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia insisted the children were refugees seeking shelter from the fighting, multiple Western governments voiced their disapproval.⁵² Not only did the Greek government condemn the child removals as genocide but so did U.S. citizen organizations and, apparently, Raphael Lemkin, the man *Collier's* credited in 1951 with the United Nations genocide treaty.⁵³

The dominance of the official Greek position was perhaps most clearly displayed in the way that the U.S. press discussed Queen Fredrica's children's villages

⁵⁰*NYT*, "Reds' Taking," March 2, 1948.

⁵¹*Dallas Morning News*, "The U.N. at Work," March 9, 1948, Section II, 17; *Dallas Morning News*, "The U.N. at Work," March 24, 1948, Section II, 21; *Dallas Morning News*, "Reds Accuse American in Child's Death," June 14, 1948, Section I, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, "U.S. Goes To Bat for Greek Children Behind Iron Curtain," June 27, 1948, Section I, 9; *Dallas Morning News*, "Red Cross Probes Greek Removals," October 13, 1948, Section I, 1; *NYT*, "Reds' Seizure," March 6, 1948; *NYT*, "Plan to Move," March 8, 1948; Sulzberger, "Abductions by Greek," June 21, 1948.

⁵²*Dallas Morning News*, "Bulgar Says Talks with Greece Fail," June 28, 1948, Section I, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, "Curtain Trio Condemned in U.N. Vote," November 28, 1948, Section I, 1; *NYT*, "Greek Reds Announce Childrens Transfer," March 4, 1948, 3; *NYT*, "Action on," March 5, 1948; *NYT*, "Reds' Seizure," March 6, 1948; *NYT*, "Rumania Taking," March 7, 1948; *NYT*, "Action on," March 12, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greek Terror Plea," March 29, 1948; *NYT*, "Care of," April 4, 1948; *NYT*, "Issue on," April 5, 1948; *NYT*, "Greek Girls," April 11, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greece is Spurned," June 9, 1948; *NYT*, "Poland Disputes," June 10, 1948.

⁵³*NYT*, "Genocide Inquiry On Soviet Is Urged," November 25, 1951; American Citizens National Association, "Letters to the Times: 'Action Urged on Genocide,'" *NYT*, June 16, 1951, 24;

and the children's camps in the communist satellite countries. By 1949 when the civil war ended, 50,000 Greek children had been taken from their parents, with approximately 30,000 of those children under the care of the Greek government.⁵⁴ As anthropologists Eftihia Voutira and Aiglia Brouskou argue, "the two systems were remarkably similar in terms of contexts in which children were to be educated, the methods used, the ends envisaged, and the criteria for success."⁵⁵ However, even in a *Collier's* article that admitted there was "propaganda on both sides," the authors still maintained that "the horrifying fact remains that the Cominform, its objective Indoctrination, is plainly guilty of one of history's most brutal and cynical violations of a fundamental human right—the right of parents to bring up their own child." The same article described the Greek government's program as an "initiative to rescue youngsters imperiled by shifting battlefields."⁵⁶ Repeatedly, U.S. accounts praised Queen Frederica's camps, reiterated that communists had kidnapped the Greek children in order to indoctrinate them, and rarely printed the communist explanations that they had saved the children from hunger and violence without a Greek response to negate it.⁵⁷

NYT, "The Crime of Genocide," March 14, 1953, 14; Herbert Yahraes, "He Gave a Name to the World's Most Horrible Crime," *Collier's* (March 9, 1951), 28.

⁵⁴Eftihia Voutira and Aigli Brouskou, "Borrowed Children in the Greek Civil War," in *Abandoned Children*, ed. by Catherine Panter-Brick and Malcolm T. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 96, 97.

⁵⁵Voutira and Brouskou, "Borrowed Children," 99.

⁵⁶*Collier's* European Team, "28,000 Children Missing: Darkest Episode of the Cold War," *Collier's* (July 8, 1950), 19.

⁵⁷*NYT*, "Reds' Taking," March 2, 1948; *NYT*, "Action on," March 5, 1948; *NYT*, "Rumania Taking," March 7, 1948; *NYT*, "Plan to Move," March 8, 1948; *NYT*, "Rebel Band Caught," March 8, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greek Terror Plea," March 29, 1948; *NYT*, "Care of," April 4, 1948; *NYT*, "Issue on," April 5, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greece is Spurned," June 9, 1948; Sulzberger, "Abductions by Greek," June 21, 1948; *NYT*, "Greece Prods U.N. Over Kidnappings," June 22, 1948, 18; *NYT*, "Rebel Chief Denies," June 23, 1948; *NYT*, "U.S. Bids East Yield Greece's Children," June 25, 1948, 14; *NYT*, "Greek Children

Clearly, the official Greek position dominated U.S. discourse on the removed children but, like the discourse on sexual psychopaths, the dominant narrative was not monolithic.

Just as Americans took action in response to the narrative of sexual psychopaths, Americans also responded to stories about the abducted Greek children. A parade in New York City in 1949 celebrating the 128th anniversary of Greek independence consisted of 15,000 participants, some of whom carried signs that read, “We protest the abduction of Greek children by the Soviets.”⁵⁸ In 1950, the parade was dedicated to demanding the release of the Greek children from communist satellite states. Leading the parade with her father, the grand marshal, Anastasia Vagionis wore a black mourning band for the children with her native costume and marchers carried banners that read, “We mourn with the Greek mothers for the 28,000 children.” Other banners appealed for American mothers to support their cause.⁵⁹ A group of American teachers petitioned the World Organization for the Teaching Profession in July 1948 to take the

in Rhodes,” June 26, 1948, 6; *NYT*, “Yugoslavia Rebuffs,” June 28, 1948, Sedgwick, “Greek Army Saves,” August 21, 1948; *NYT*, “Child Kidnapping Is Held Genocide,” October 24, 1948, 12; *NYT*, “Markos Plan,” December 18, 1948; A. C. Sedgwick, “U.N. Sees Terror of Greek Parents,” *NYT*, February 7, 1949, 5; *NYT*, “Greeks Say 4,000 Ask Children Back,” February 26, 1949, 6; *NYT*, “Greece’s Kidnapped Children,” October 26, 1949, 26; *NYT*, “Greek Queen Pleads Children Be Rescued,” December 29, 1949, 11; *NYT*, “Greece’s Lament Enfolds Children,” December 30, 1949, 8; *NYT*, “Wanted: A Genocide Treaty,” January 2, 1950, 22; *NYT*, “The Greek Children,” October 18, 1950, 32; *NYT*, “Red Baby-Snatchers,” August 27, 1951, 16; *NYT*, “Treason Trial in Greece,” February, 17, 1952, 138; *Dallas Morning News*, “U.S. Goes,” June 27, 1948; *Dallas Morning News*, “Bulgar Says,” June 28, 1948; *Dallas Morning News*, “They’re Tomorrow’s Troops: European Classrooms Battle For Minds of School Children,” November 2, 1948, Section 1, 8; *Dallas Morning News*, “Reservist Knows, Loathes Stalinists,” January 17, 1951, Part III, 3; *Dallas Morning News*, “Political Kidnappings,” November 1, 1951, Part III, 2.

⁵⁸*NYT*, “15,000 March Here To Honor Greece,” March 28, 1949, 6.

⁵⁹*NYT*, “Marchers Hail Greek Freedom, Call For Liberation of Children,” March 27, 1950, 25.

necessary steps to discourage any further abductions and arrange for the return of the Greek children already removed.⁶⁰ In June 1950, the General Federation of Women's Clubs voted to petition the United States government to "make a determined effort" to achieve the return of the 28,000 children to Greece.⁶¹ In addition, Americans joined in various charitable efforts to benefit poor and battle-scarred Greek children.⁶²

By international standards, the movement of 28,000 people was really not very significant by 1948. In the aftermath of the Balkan Wars, 1,500,000 people were transferred involuntarily. The Second World War saw almost 40,000,000 civilians forcibly moved. The movement of 15,000,000 members of religious minorities followed the creation of India and Pakistan in 1947 from one country to the other.⁶³ Therefore, it was neither their numbers nor the "involuntary" nature of their movement that created so much interest in and outrage over the story of the abducted Greek children.

⁶⁰*NYT*, "Greek Child Help Urged," July 24, 1948, 15.

⁶¹Doris Greenburg, "Point 4 Endorsed by Women's Clubs," *NYT*, June 2, 1950, 26.

⁶²*NYT*, "10 Young Tourists See Sights of City," April 27, 1948, 4; *NYT*, "Envoys Say Farewell," May 2, 1948, 20; *NYT*, "Child Aid Wins," August 24, 1948; *NYT*, "Greek Ceramics on Sale," October 14, 1948, 36; *NYT*, "Greece Agrees to Aid Relief for Children," March 31, 1949, 31; *NYT*, "Orphan of Greek War Here for Operation," May 31, 1949, 21; *NYT*, "U.S. Fleet Fetes Orphans," December 26, 1949, 2; *NYT*, "The Drive Is On To Aid Children of Greece," April 13, 1950, 31; Bess Furman, "Fashion of Greece in the Ages Shown," *NYT*, April 14, 1950, 28; *NYT*, "Plight of Greece Called Appalling," May 28, 1950, 10; *NYT*, "Greek Child, Blind, Mute, Finds School Here," October 3, 1950, 27; *NYT*, "Civil War Victim, 7, Here for Surgery," March 19, 1951, 17; *NYT*, "Project Seeks \$650,000," May 29, 1952, 29; *NYT*, "Education Notes," March 8, 1953, E9; *NYT*, "U.S. Sailors Plan Party For Poor Greek Children," November 24, 1953, 7; *NYT*, "Gifts Going to Greece," March 15, 1955, 12; *Dallas Morning News*, "Save the Children Federation To Hold Silver Tea Saturday," May 1, 1949, Section III, 8; Victor Riesel, "Textile Mill Assembly To Rebuild Greek Town," *Dallas Morning News*, September 10, 1949, 3.

⁶³Gunther Beyer, "The Political Refugee: 35 Years Later," *International Migration Review* 15 (Spring-Summer 1981), 26, 28.

The Greek government used the notion of the “sacredness of the child” to gain support for its position. Claiming that, “the sacredness of the child is universally acknowledged as being the very hall-mark of civilized society,” the Greek government then implied that, by failing to recognize to such a universally accepted value, the communists were uncivilized.⁶⁴ Further, the Greek government accused the communists of abducting the children for the purpose of communist indoctrination to be used as future soldiers against the Greek state, which the Greek government charged was genocide that equated with Nazi war crimes.⁶⁵ In this narrative, with children as the victims, the communists emerged as uncivilized and brutal. Further, conflated with Nazis, they were demonized and cast into the role of the aggressive enemy to the free world.

The “sacredness of the child” was a prevailing theme, if not phrase, of the narrative of the sexual psychopath.⁶⁶ Magazine articles described sexual psychopaths as “despoilers” of children and “child violators.”⁶⁷ Within the pages of professional journals, “experts” referred to sexual psychopaths as “corrupter[s] of the minds and bodies of little children” who had no right to the protections individuals accused of crimes traditionally enjoyed in the United States.⁶⁸ In addition, the sexual psychopath in the form of a homosexual converted children because he, “must have degenerate

⁶⁴Rodocanachi, “Against and For the Greek Child,” 6.

⁶⁵Rodocanachi, “Against and For the Greek Child,” 7-10.

⁶⁶Rodocanachi, “Against and For the Greek Child,” 6.

⁶⁷Howard Whitman, “The City that Does Something About Sex Crime,” *Collier’s*, January 21, 1950, 20; J. Edgar Hoover, “How Safe Is Your Daughter?” *The American Magazine*, July 1947, 102.

⁶⁸Reinhardt and Fisher, “The Sexual Psychopath and the Law,” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 39 (March-April 1949), 741-2.

companions, and is ever seeking younger victims.”⁶⁹ In this manner, both narratives drew on the image of children as sacred, innocent, and vulnerable targets in order to vilify both communists and homosexuals.

In February 1946, Chargé d’Affaires in Moscow George F. Kennan’s wrote the Long Telegram, which shaped U.S. foreign policy makers’ thinking toward the Soviet Union, provided the basis for the strategy of Containment, and was implemented by the Truman Doctrine.⁷⁰ Kennan wrote:

Russian rulers have invariably sensed that their rule was relatively archaic in form fragile and artificial in its psychological foundation, unable to stand comparison or contact with political systems of Western countries. [...] In this dogma [Marxism], with its basic altruism of purpose, they found justification for their instinctive fear of outside world, for the dictatorship without which they did not know how to rule, for cruelties they did not dare not to inflict, for sacrifice they felt bound to demand. In the name of Marxism they sacrificed every single ethical value in their methods and tactics.⁷¹

According to historian John Lewis Gaddis, in the Long Telegram Kennan characterized the Soviets as “too unsophisticated to know how to govern by any other means than repression.”⁷² Historian Melvyn Leffler argues that, “Kennan urged policymakers to view Soviet Russia as their enemy” and that “while Soviet leaders were impervious to the logic of reason, they were responsive to manifestations of threat.”⁷³ Essentially, Kennan’s analysis provided the basis for U.S. policymakers to believe the

⁶⁹Ralph H. Major, Jr., “New Moral Menace To Our Youth,” *Coronet*, September 1950, 102.

⁷⁰Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 18-19, 22, 23.

⁷¹George F. Kennan, Chargé D’Affaires, Moscow to George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, Moscow, February 22, 1946, 861.00/2-2246 National Security Archive Website, George Washington University, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm> (accessed 5-26-2007).

⁷²Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, 19-20.

⁷³Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 108.

Soviet leaders were unsophisticated, uncivilized individuals who only understood aggression.

The narrative of the abducted Greek children communicated these ideas directly to the American people. An article printed in *Time* in April 1948 asserted that the Soviets supported the Greek communist forces, which corroborated Truman's contention that the Greek Civil War was a front in the fight against Soviet expansion. The author's description of the communist fighters as "a motley collection of uprooted folk," whose "mission was akin to that of Communists everywhere: to uproot their countrymen, to spread despair, to kill hope, to smother enterprise, to prevent the sowing of crops, until even the tyranny of Communism would seem by comparison a haven" clearly indicated their hostility to civilization and violent tendencies.⁷⁴ The brutality of the communists was apparently boundless as they had cruelly torn defenseless children from crying mothers and shot fathers protecting their families. In addition, that communists had violated "a fundamental human right—the right of a parent to bring up their own children" not only indicted communists as uncivilized but also as contemptuous of human rights.⁷⁵ Calling the abductions genocide, and, similarly, equating them with Nazi war crimes, signaled that communists were enemies of and threatening to the Western, free world on par with Hitler.⁷⁶

⁷⁴*Time*, "Captain of the Crag," April 5, 1948, www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,798297,00.html (accessed May 25, 2007).

⁷⁵*Collier's*, "28,000 Children Missing," 18-19.

⁷⁶Yahraes, "He Gave a Name to the World's Most Horrible Crime," *Collier's*, 28.

In addition, Kennan stressed that Soviet leaders' statements could not be trusted.

In the Long Telegram, Kennan wrote to the Secretary of State:

please note that premises on which this [communist] party line is based are for most part simply not true [...] It indicates that Soviet party line is not based on any objective analysis of situation beyond Russia's borders; that it has, indeed, little to do with conditions outside of Russia; that it arises mainly from basic inner-Russian necessities which existed before recent war and exist today.⁷⁷

Kennan's statement referred to Soviet rhetoric concerning capitalist expansionism and a future war between the communist world and the capitalist world. However, his claim that the language was not based on any real circumstances but rather was a deliberate attempt by the Soviet leaders to exploit international situations in order to manipulate their own people, led U.S. policy maker to view them as dishonest and without legitimate security concerns.⁷⁸ Fundamentally, statements by Soviet officials were propaganda and unreliable.

While few U.S. press accounts overtly characterized communist explanations for the removal of the Greek children as propaganda, neither were they reported in the same manner as Greek statements on the matter. Most often, only the official Greek position was reported.⁷⁹ When the U.S. press did print communist explanations that the Greek

⁷⁷Kennan to Marshall, Moscow, February, 22, 1946, National Security Archive Website.

⁷⁸Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 108.

⁷⁹*NYT*, "Reds' Taking," March 2, 1948; *NYT*, "Action on," March 5, 1948; *NYT*, "Plan to Move," March 8, 1948; *NYT*, "Rebel Band Caught," March 8, 1948; *NYT*, "Action on Greek," March 12, 1948; *NYT*, "Big Greek Rebel," March 28, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greek Terror Plea," March 29, 1948; *NYT*, "Greek Puts Peace," June 5, 1948; *NYT*, "British Condemn Kidnappings," June 25, 1948, 14; *NYT*, "Greek Children in Rhodes," June 26, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greek Army Saves," August 21, 1948, *NYT*, "Child Kidnapping," October 24, 1948; *NYT*, "Athens Counters Rebel Peace Plea," January 29, 1949, 3; Sedgwick, "U.N. Sees Terror," February, 7, 1949; *NYT*, "Greece Again Protests to U.N.," February, 8, 1949, 9; *NYT*, "Athens Reports Gain In Spite of Civil War," February, 17, 1949, 11; *NYT*, "Greeks Say 4,000 Ask Children Back," February, 26, 1949, 8; *NYT*, "Greek Queen Pleads," December 29, 1949;

children were evacuated to save them from the hazards of war, it was usually with a Greek rejoinder.⁸⁰ On even fewer occasions, communist statements stood alone.⁸¹ Preference for the Greek version of events and distrust of the communist account was communicated by the amount of newsprint the opposing sides were given. In addition, U.S. reporters sometimes adopted the official Greek position, most often in editorials but also occasionally in legitimate news articles.⁸² For example, in June 1948, C. L. Sulzberger, reporting for *The New York Times*, wrote, “Between 8,000 and 10,000 Greek children have been kidnapped by General Markos Vafiades’ rebel guerilla army and sent to camps in the neighboring Soviet satellite states.”⁸³ Clearly, U.S. readers should understand that the official Greek position was the reliable version while communist statements were dubious.

The narrative of the Greek children communicated key beliefs held by policymakers to the U.S. public that underpinned the strategy of Containment and U.S. foreign policy. The portrayal of communists as brutally oppressive, indifferent to

NYT, “Greece’s Lament,” December 30, 1949; *NYT*, “Wanted,” January 2, 1950; *NYT*, “Archbishop Plans Appeal to Truman,” January 17, 1950, 8; *NYT*, “Cleric Asks Truman’s Aid,” January 21, 1950, 3,

⁸⁰*NYT*, “Greek Reds,” March 4, 1948; *NYT*, “Reds’ Seizure,” March 6, 1948; *NYT*, “Care of Greek Children,” April 4, 1948; *NYT*, “Issue on,” April 5, 1948; Sedgwick, “Greece Is Spurned,” June 9, 1948; *NYT*, “Greeks Unconvinced,” June 14, 1948; Sulzberger, “Abductions,” June 21, 1948; *NYT*, “U.S. Bids East,” June 28, 1948; *NYT*, “Yugoslavia Rebuffs,” June 28, 1948; *NYT*, “Yugoslavs Report,” October 13, 1948; *NYT*, “Greek Child Exiles,” December 3, 1948; Dana Adams Schmidt, “Czechs Get Appeal on Greek Children,” *NYT*, February 23, 1950, 11.

⁸¹*NYT*, “Rumania Taking Children,” March 7, 1948; *NYT*, “Greek Girls Deny,” April 11, 1948; *NYT*, “Poland Disputes Athens,” June 10, 1948; *NYT*, “Rumania Keeps Children,” June 27, 1948; *NYT*, “Albania Rejects Charge,” July 24, 1948; *NYT*, “Sofia Red Cross,” December 14, 1948; *NYT*, “Markos Plan,” December 18, 1948; *NYT*, “Article 3—No Title,” March 5, 1949, 4.

⁸²Sulzberger, “Abductions,” June 21, 1948, *NYT*, “Liquidating the Greek War,” September 29, 1949, 28; *NYT*, “Greece’s Kidnapped Children,” October 28, 1949; *NYT*, “Wanted,” January 2, 1950, *NYT*, “The Greek Children,” October 18, 1950.

⁸³Sulzberger, “Abductions,” June 21, 1948.

human rights, and untrustworthy functioned to tie communists with totalitarianism and to conflate the Soviet with Nazis. These concepts, that presented communists generally and Soviets specifically as a clear and threatening enemy of the United States and Western Civilization, facilitated securing congressional and public support for foreign policy initiatives that otherwise would be difficult to sell.⁸⁴

The narrative of the abducted Greek children provided the U.S. public with a conceptual framework through which to view communists. Similarly, the narrative of the sexual psychopath supplied a schema with which to view homosexuals. While these narratives originated from different events, they both functioned to reduce complex situations into simpler forms, from which obvious villains emerged. Those villains served as surrogates for the more complicated issues, either Soviet aggression or changing norms for gender, sexual behavior, and family structure, that Americans found more difficult to confront. By taking action against communists and homosexuals, Americans were fighting proxy wars, confronting their concerns only on the margins and battling caricatures.

On a different level, however, the narrative of the kidnapped Greek children communicated a gendered view of world politics to the American public. This view, held by many American foreign policy makers, regarded NATO as a kind of marriage with the United States as the husband and the weaker European countries as females or children. Greece, in the weak and feminine position, was victimized by communist

⁸⁴Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 100.

guerillas, assumed to be backed by the hypermasculine, aggressive Soviet Union.⁸⁵

Reports of Stalin as both a homosexual and a “sex maniac” with a proclivity for young girls bolstered the image of Stalinist Soviet Union as a sexual aggressor.⁸⁶ Seen in this manner, the United States took a masculine role as protector and provider to the dependent Greece with the creation of the Truman Doctrine.

Images of females figured prominently in the narrative of abducted Greek children. On the cover of “Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive,” published by the Royal Greek Embassy in 1950, the nation of Greece was depicted as Athena weeping with the caption “Greece mourns for her 28,000 children abducted by the communists.”⁸⁷ A photo of the heartbroken Greek mother, her grief on display, also portrayed Greece as dependent and helpless, unable to protect even her children.⁸⁸ In addition, Greek Queen Fredrica took a leading role in the narrative of the abducted children as the “First Greek Mother” and a spokesperson on the matter. She spearheaded the effort to gather Greek children into “Children’s Cities” in order to save them from communist abduction and regularly visited “her” children there in addition to raising funds to provide for their support.⁸⁹ Although Queen Fredrica was more visible

⁸⁵Frank Costigliola, “The Nuclear Family: Tropes of Gender and Pathology in the Western Alliance,” *Diplomatic History* 21 (Spring 1997), 163-169.

⁸⁶*Dallas Morning News*, “Former Red Tags Stalin Czarist Spy,” 12 June 1956, Part 1, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, “Stalin Sex Maniac, Khrushchev Quoted,” 19 April 1956, Part 1, 1. For the identification of a country’s leader with that country, see Carol Cohn, “Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War,” in *Gendering Wartalk* ed. Miriam Cooke and Angela Woolacott (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 239-241.

⁸⁷Royal Greek Embassy, “Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive,” cover.

⁸⁸Royal Greek Embassy, “Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive,” 14.

⁸⁹Rodocanachi, “Against and For the Greek Child,” 18-25; Royal Greek Embassy, “Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive,” 11. See also Eftihia and Brouskou, “Borrowed Children in the Greek Civil War,” and Lars Bærentzen, “The Paidomazoma and the Queen’s Camps.”

in Greece, her statements on subject and her visit to the United States garnered U.S. coverage.⁹⁰

Accepting the economic and military support from the Truman Doctrine necessarily put Greece into a subordinate and, therefore, feminine position in relation to the United States. However, the narrative of the abducted Greek children only amplified that arrangement by relying on images of women to both emphasize Greece's victimization at the hands of the communist aggressors and the country's inability to protect its own children. In addition, the narrative used images of women to mobilize public outrage over the nation's mistreatment and to amass advocates who could secure the repatriation of the children because the Greek government proved unable. Greece not only depended on the United States for subsistence and protection but also looked for help rectifying injuries that had occurred during the period when it had been without protection.

Interestingly, the discourse that held Greece as a victim of the hypermasculine Soviet-backed communists paralleled the narrative of the sexual psychopath in the United States. Like women in the United States who ventured out without male protection and who were vulnerable to attack by sexual psychopaths, Greece had been without U.S. protection at the time of "her" attack, gaining military aid and advisors

⁹⁰Sulzberger, "Abductions," June 21, 1948; *NYT*, "British Condemn," June 25, 1948; Sedgwick, "Greek Army Saves," August 21, 1948; *NYT*, "Child Aid Wins," August 24, 1948; *NYT*, "Greek Queen Pleads," December 24, 1949; *NYT*, "Haven Asked for Greek Children," March 22, 1950, 23; Furman, "Fashion of Greece," April 14, 1950; *NYT*, "Girl War Victim, 7, Here for Surgery," March 7, 1951, 17; Bess Furman, "Annapolis Greets Rulers of Greece," *NYT*, October 31, 1953, 4.

from the Truman Doctrine but only joining NATO in 1952.⁹¹ Clearly then, the narrative of the abducted Greek children served as warning to scare other “weak” nations into aligning with the United States just as the narrative of the sexual psychopath undercut women’s independence in the United States.

Recurrent in the narrative of the abducted Greek children was the notion that the communists had taken the children for communist indoctrination. Once indoctrinated, the children would fight against their own homeland. The Greek government claimed that this act was genocide since the children would no longer be Greek but “blind and fanatical instruments of totalitarian regimes.”⁹² Imbedded in this narrative was the concept that communists sought to subvert members of a society in order to create internal chaos and, ultimately revolution designed to obliterate Western Civilization, of which Greece was a primary symbol.

The narrative of the abducted Greek children demonstrated that communists did not just target adults. Various articles stressed children’s susceptibility to

⁹¹ Wittner, *American Intervention in Greece*, 294.

⁹²Yahraes, “He Gave a Name to the World’s Most Horrible Crime,” *Collier’s*, 28; *Collier’s*, “28,000 Children Missing,” 18, 44; *NYT*, “Reds’ Taking,” March 2, 1948; *NYT*, “Rebel Band Caught,” March 8, 1948; *NYT*, “Care of Greek,” April 4, 1948; Sulzberger, “Abductions,” January 21, 1948; *NYT*, Greece Prods U.N.,” June 23, 1948; *NYT*, “Greek Child Help,” July 24, 1948, *NYT*, “Child Kidnapping,” October 24, 1948; Sedgwick, “U.N. Sees Terror,” February 7, 1949; George Barrett, “Greece Says Reds Step Up the War,” *NYT*, July 20, 1949, 2; *NYT*, “Greece’s Kidnapped Children,” October 26, 1949; *NYT*, “Wanted,” January 2, 1950; *NYT*, “Religionists Back U.N. Genocide Pact,” January 26, 1950, 9; *NYT*, “The Greek Children,” October 18, 1950; *NYT*, “Greek Youth To Return,” November 23, 1950, 10; A. C. Sedgwick, “21 Greek Children Dazed at Return,” *NYT*, November 26, 1950, 7; *NYT*, “Red Baby-Snatchers,” August 27, 1951; *NYT*, “Pact for the People,” December, 16, 1951, 166; *NYT*, “Children’s Return Held Dim in Greece,” January 30, 1952, 9; *NYT*, “Treason Trial,” February 17, 1952; *NYT*, “Greece Hits U.N. Vote on Children’s Return,” November 26, 1952, 7; *NYT*, “Stolen Greek Children,” November 26, 1952, 22; *NYT*, “The Crime of Genocide,” March 14, 1953; *NYT*, “U.S. Support for Greece,” December 28, 1961, 26; *Dallas Morning News*, “European Classrooms,” November 2, 1948; *Dallas Morning News*, *Political Kidnapping*, November 1, 1951.

indoctrination. The U.S. press reported that when the first group of abducted children returned from Yugoslavia, there was “widespread misgivings among Greeks” and suspicion that the children might serve as “juvenile ambassadors of communism.”⁹³ Americans held similar fears as expressed in an editorial in *The New York Times* that asserted that the children, after four or more years of indoctrination, would “return to Greece as trained fifth columnists.”⁹⁴ While the Greek government, with the support of many American citizens, called for the repatriation of the abducted children, they also feared the communists had converted the children into enemies.

The narrative of the abducted Greek children mirrored narratives about communists in the United States. In an article published in 1947, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.), described U.S. communists as “revolutionists” who were “steeped in stealth, trickery, and deceit.”⁹⁵ Further, he asserted that the communists ran youth recruitment centers under the guise of combating juvenile delinquency in order to supply leadership for “mass work.”⁹⁶ Harry D. Gideonse, President of Brooklyn College, warned parents in July 1948 that their children in the nation’s elementary schools, high schools, and colleges were “exposed to Communism every year.” He claimed that “the directors of Communist strategy are still concentrating an enormous effort on the youth front.”⁹⁷ Harvey Job Matusow, paid

⁹³*NYT*, “Greek Youth,” November 23, 1950.

⁹⁴*NYT*, “The Greek Children,” October 19, 1950.

⁹⁵J. Edgar Hoover, “Red Fascism in the United States Today,” *The American Magazine*, (February 1947), 24, 90.

⁹⁶Hoover, “Red Fascism,” 90.

⁹⁷Harry D. Gideonse, “The Reds Are After Your Child,” *The American Magazine*, (July 1948), 19, 20.

informant for the F.B.I., testified in 1952 that communists were attempting to subvert the Boy Scouts and that communists had rewritten Mother Goose Rhymes in order to indoctrinate children.⁹⁸ While Americans parents were being warned about communists targeting their children, the narrative of the abduction of the Greek children provided concrete proof of the communists' intentions.

Fears about communists' danger to children paralleled fears about homosexuals. Like communists, homosexuals were after children.⁹⁹ At the same time that parents in the United States worried that communists aspired to convert their children, articles also stressed that homosexuals seduced children in order to secure "degenerate companions."¹⁰⁰ In 1949 when Arthur Clayton Hester went on trial for the murder of his guardian of four years, Dr. John Lord, eighteen-year-old Hester claimed Lord was homosexual.¹⁰¹ Hester's attorneys attempted to make Lord's homosexuality a central issue in the case, prompting Judge Penn Jackson to ask who was on trial: Hester or Lord. Although Hester admitted killing Lord after an "angry quarrel," the jury did not

⁹⁸"Harvey Job Matusow," oral history interview by Griffin Fariello, *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995), 102, 103; *NYT*, "Attempts in 1930's Cited," August 13, 1952, 10. Matusow recanted in 1955, claiming that all of his testimony had been false. *NYT*, "The Professional Informer," February 5, 1955, 14; *NYT*, "Matusow Sought Anti-Reds' Favor," February 12, 1955, 10. Interestingly, although the Boy Scouts came under investigation in the United States, they were, apparently, sufficiently anti-communist to assist with the "re-education" of youthful former GDA fighters in Greece. A. C. Sedgwick, *NYT*, "Greece Will Begin Remolding Rebels," April 4, 1949, 5.

⁹⁹Howard Whitman, "Terror in Our Cities No. 1—Detroit", *Collier's*, November 19, 1949, 13, 14-15, 65; Howard Whitman, "Nobody's Safe in Philadelphia," *Collier's*, December 17, 1949, 17; Whitman, "The City That Does Something About Sex Crime," 20-21, 64; Howard Whitman, "Terror in Washington," *Collier's*, June 24, 1950, 21, 52; *Time*, "Queer People," October 10, 1949, 52.

¹⁰⁰Major, "New Moral Menace to Our Youth," 102.

¹⁰¹*Dallas Morning News*, "Hester Murder Trial Begins at Cleburne," April 26, 1949, Section I, 10; *Dallas Morning News*, "Hester Reverses Statements Again," May 3, 1949, Section I, 4.

follow the prosecutor's recommendation and sentence the teen to death but opted instead for fifty years in prison, suggesting that the defense strategy of injecting "a theme of sexual perversion into the trial" did influence the outcome of the case. In addition, press accounts noted Hester's youth, attractive appearance, and prior residence at a state orphanage as well as Lord's advanced age, which fit into the larger narrative that portrayed adult homosexuals as seeking out the company of inappropriately young and vulnerable companions.¹⁰² Both communists and homosexuals indoctrinated the young to a way of life that was inimical to Western values of democracy, heteronormality, and the American way of life. The matching narratives of the communists and the sexual psychopath, existing simultaneously, blurred the distinction between communists and sexual psychopaths and created an atmosphere of encroaching danger.

In the milieu of distress surrounding the onset of the Korean War, Congress passed the Internal Security Act of 1950. This act, among other things, provided for the "preventative detention of suspected subversives" during times of national emergency and required all communist organizations and members to register with the Attorney General.¹⁰³ These measures were similar to requirements placed on sex offenders during the same period. Sex offenders were also required by some localities to register

¹⁰²*Dallas Morning News*, "Hester Murder Trial," April 26, 1949; *Dallas Morning News*, "Hester Denies He Sprang Out, Slew Guardian," April 29, 1949, Section I, 7; *Dallas Morning News*, "Hester Reverses Statements," May 3, 1949.

¹⁰³William R. Tanner and Robert Griffith, "Legislative Politics and 'McCarthyism': The Internal Security Act of 1950," in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis (New York: New Viewpoints, 1947), 174, 178.

with law enforcement and the sexual psychopath laws passed by many states subjected homosexuals to indeterminate incarceration (in treatment facilities) without ever committing a crime.¹⁰⁴ In both cases, the protection of society trumped any rights of either the communist or the sex offender.¹⁰⁵

While the parallels between laws regarding communists and homosexuals are striking, they are not surprising. In the popular American imagination, communism was not a legitimate political affiliation; a communist was a type of person. A communist had given up allegiance to his country and given over his personal will to the party.¹⁰⁶ In the same way, homosexuality did not describe a behavior but a type of person who had no control over his sexual desires and conduct. Homosexuals, through sexual non-conformity, disrupted the social order of the country.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, communists sought to destroy the political order of the country. As illustrated to the American public by the narratives of the sexual psychopath and the abduction of the Greek children, both homosexuals and communists could be violent when fulfilling the command of their directing influence.

These constructions were in evidence when Congress took up the issue of immigration. Included with the 700 classes of aliens deemed ineligible for entry into

¹⁰⁴J Philip Jenkins, *Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester In Modern America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 80; Paul W. Tappan, "Sentences for Sex Criminals," *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 42 (September-October 1951), 332.

¹⁰⁵Tanner and Griffith, "Legislative Politics and 'McCarthyism,'" 188; Reinhardt and Fisher, "The Sexual Psychopath and the Law," 735.

¹⁰⁶William M. Wiecek, "The Legal Foundations of Domestic Anticommunism: The Background of *Smith v United States*," *The Supreme Court Review* no vol. # (2001), 378, 407.

¹⁰⁷Margot Canaday, "Who is a Homosexual?: The Consolidation of Sexual Identities in Mid-Twentieth-Century American Immigration Law," *Law and Social Inquiry* 28 (Spring 2003), 363.

the United States by Immigration and Naturalization bill were both communists and homosexuals. The bill relaxed the Internal Security Act to exclude only those immigrants who were voluntary members of communist organizations.¹⁰⁸ However, the bill tightened restrictions relative to past immigration laws on homosexuals. It retained the exclusion of aliens with any past crime involving moral turpitude. In addition, the bill included a provision for the deportation of aliens convicted of a crime within five years of entry involving moral turpitude serious enough to result in one year or more incarceration or two or more such crimes any time after entry regardless of the sentence. Further, the inclusion of a section excluding psychopathic personalities, while interpreted by many immigration officials as updating the previous law's use of "constitutional psychopathic inferior," was aimed directly at homosexuals.¹⁰⁹

While Congressmen seemed to agree that homosexuals, like communists, should be denied entry to the country, they debated the proper wording. Representative Emanuel Celler, Democrat from New York, in 1951, questioning the wisdom of including the term "psychopathic personality" commented, "I challenge any man of this committee to give me an exact definition or a worth-while definition of 'psychopathic personality' [...] I have yet to find out what it means." He continued later, "Another classification is homosexuals or sex perverts. How in the world is the inspector going

¹⁰⁸U.S. Senate, "Revision of Immigration, Naturalization, and Nationality Laws," Report 1137, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, January 10, 1952, 10.

¹⁰⁹Canaday, "Who is a Homosexual?" 358-359.

to determine whether the person before him is a homosexual?”¹¹⁰ Representative Cellers’ comments reflect both the vague nature of term psychopath and the belief, bolstered by Kinsey’s findings, that homosexuals, like communists, were inconspicuous and difficult to detect.¹¹¹

By 1952, as the bill approached completion, the clause referring explicitly to homosexuals and sex perverts had been removed. Democratic Senator Pat McCarran’s report on the bill stated:

the Public Health Service has advised that the provision for the exclusion of aliens afflicted with psychopathic personality or mental defect which appears in the instant bill is sufficiently broad to provide for the exclusion of homosexuals and sex perverts. This change of nomenclature is not to be construed in any way as modifying the intent to exclude all aliens who are sexual deviates.¹¹²

As his statement indicates, it was exactly the vagueness of the term psychopath that allowed it to be applied to homosexuals. Further, by naming homosexuals explicitly, McCarran signaled the particular danger with which the group was associated. In addition, the change reflected the prevailing psychiatric view of homosexuals that claimed that while their gender non-conformity might not be obvious, they would generally have other mental problems.¹¹³

Just a month and half before the Congress passed the Immigration and Naturalization Law of 1952, Republican Representative Katharine St. George of New

¹¹⁰United States Congress, Subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary, *Revision of Immigration, Naturalization, and Nationality Laws: Joint Hearings before the Subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary*, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, 15 March 1951, 361.

¹¹¹Canaday, “Who is a Homosexual?” 357.

¹¹²U.S. Senate, *Revision of Immigration and Nationality Laws*, January 10, 1952.

¹¹³Canaday, “Who is a Homosexual?” 358.

York read an article into the Congressional Record entitled “Homosexual International.” Originally published in the Washington newsletter *Human Events*, the article claimed that homosexuals

belong to a sinister, mysterious, and efficient international. Welded together by the identity of their forbidden desires, of their strange, sad needs, habits, danger, not to mention their outrageous vocabulary, members of this international constitute a world-wide conspiracy against society. This conspiracy has spread all over the globe...members of one conspiracy are prone to join another conspiracy.¹¹⁴

There, in a two-page article was the blending of the communist narrative with the homosexual narrative that so naturally synchronized in the popular imagination.

Homosexuals and communists were equal in status, kind, and objective to the American public. The twin menaces reinforced one another and elicited an equivalent response.

The postwar sex crime panic was a product not only of domestic distress but also was a reflection of fear about the changed and dangerous Cold War world. The image of the sexual psychopath, while manifesting meanings about permissible sexual behavior and gender identity also merged with the image of the communist to compound the anxiety in American culture about internal subversives. The narratives

¹¹⁴U.S. Congress, “Homosexual International,” *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (May 1, 1952) 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, vol. 98 pt. 10 (May 1, 1952), A2652-A2654. *Human Events* is a weekly right-wing periodical that was founded in 1944 to provide a forum to conservatives, particularly those critical of the Roosevelt administrations foreign policy and the New Deal. The editors were opposed to friendly relations with the Soviet Union and, after a change in editorship in 1950, the articles advocated U. S. attempts to overthrow or roll back the Soviet Union. In addition, the editors characterized Congressional investigations into domestic communism as fair and praised Senator Joseph McCarthy’s work combating communist subversion but concluded that he gave up too soon. While the periodical was most concerned with communism, domestic and foreign, it did print articles promoting conservative positions on many political issues but had little to say on race. *Human Events* was a supporter of Ronald Reagan, whose articles appeared in the publication throughout his political career and he kept “several dozen copies” of the periodical in the White House during his administration.

of the sexually deviant homosexual and the politically deviant communist, both destructive enemies of the American way of life, fused to reinforce one another.

Ronald Lora and William Henry Longton, ed., *The Conservative Press in Twentieth-Century America*, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1999), 449-52, 456.

CHAPTER 4

FEDERAL FORAYS INTO THE REALM OF THE LASCIVIOUS

“The McCarran Act had passed and I remember that each of us had to go into Clarence Canary’s office to get our paycheck. He sat there with the paycheck in one hand and this little sheet of paper which he said you had to sign before you can get your paycheck. Of course, what it said was, ‘I have never undertaken the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, etc., etc.’ That was the beginning of it. By the time I left, I would say that probably the atmosphere was getting as close to a Russian atmosphere as one can imagine. People were beginning to take out personal vendettas by informing on other people in the Department—saying, he or she is really a homosexual or a drinker...” Dorothy Greene Johnson, State Department Employee, Cultural Centers Office ¹

Loyalty and security were separate issues confronting government employees. However, in the minds of officials charged under President Truman’s Loyalty Program with judging these cases, loyalty and security were intertwined well before Joseph R. McCarthy’s allegations brought these issues together and attracted media scrutiny. The dominant narrative during the postwar years ranked homosexuality as the most serious of all the security risks and it remained so long after the period of hysteria over communist infiltration of the U.S. government subsided. Accusations of homosexuals and communists in the employ of the government generally, and the State Department

¹“Dorothy Greene Johnson,” oral history interview, *Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection*, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren, (CD Rom, 2000).

specifically, played on concerns about class and gender within American society as well as provided potent political weapons to be used against enemies.

Charges of communist infiltration of the government were not new in the postwar years. Republicans had made allegations of subversive activities and communist allegiances among federal employees at least since President Franklin D. Roosevelt began the New Deal. However, in 1946 the political climate changed. A number of confessions and accusations involving federal employees with alleged communist connections, particularly in the State Department, generated massive publicity, which prompted a House of Representatives investigation into loyalty procedures for federal employees. In November of that year, following the report resulting from that investigation and the Republican takeover of Congress, Truman established the Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty. The following March, he issued another executive order creating a permanent loyalty program for federal employees.² The State Department, prompted by heavy media coverage, instituted its own Loyalty-Security Board in 1947 that operated within the president's program as did some other governmental departments dealing with highly sensitive material.³

Although the president and Congress both agreed that the government should employ only loyal people, the term "loyalty" itself proved to be problematic. As Yale Law Professor Ralph S. Brown, Jr. wrote in 1958, "loyalty is a word of many

²Athan Theoharis, *The Truman Presidency: The Origins of the Imperial Presidency and the National Security State* (Stanfordville, NY: Earl M. Coleman Enterprises, Inc., 1979), 249.

³Eleanor Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1953), 37.

interpretations.”⁴ New York attorney Eleanor Bontecou observed in 1953 that by definition loyalty “relates to qualities of heart, mind, and character, covers many differing ideas, and is a ‘carapace’ word from which all content, save the emotional, may readily be drained.”⁵ Further, at first glance, the fields of loyalty and security appear easily distinguishable, but concerns with security justified loyalty procedures and therefore, the two became inseparably linked. In the actual application of President Truman’s loyalty program, loyalty boards judged the cases before them on questions of loyalty as well as security.⁶ Members of loyalty boards found that cases before them were easier to decide based on security than loyalty. As stated by the chairman of the State Department Loyalty-Security Board, “Loyalty is a state of mind and a security risk is a fact.”⁷ Some loyalty boards did not bother to define loyalty at all and simply decided cases based on security considerations, which effectively blurred the distinction between the two categories. In still other cases, employees were cleared of disloyalty but still fired as security risks.⁸ Attorney General J. Howard McGrath wrote to President Truman in 1949 that, “observations...have been made to the effect that the program should be a ‘Security’ rather than a ‘Loyalty’ program.”⁹

⁴Ralph S. Brown, Jr., *Loyalty and Security: Employment Tests in the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), 4.

⁵Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program*, 28.

⁶Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program*, 21, 28-9, 37, 48-9; Brown, *Loyalty and Security*, 9.

⁷Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program*, 50.

⁸Bontecou, *The Federal-Loyalty Security Program*, 49-50. By December 1950, 14 employees left government jobs under these circumstances.

⁹J. Howard McGrath, “Letter, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath to Donald Dawson (Administrative Assistant to President Truman)”, December 23, 1949, reprinted in extracted form in Theoharis, *The Truman Presidency*, 268-9.

Clearly then, even in the earliest days of the postwar loyalty programs, security concerns figured prominently in the discourse of the loyalty of federal employees. Security risks were divided into two categories: “reliability risks,” those employees whose weakness of character and instability made them unsuitable for working with sensitive material and “pressure risks,” those employees whose personal lives or backgrounds made them vulnerable to blackmail and divulging sensitive material.¹⁰ Homosexuals were a particularly potent symbol for security risks because they crossed into both categories.

Homosexual behavior, by contemporary standards, was immoral and therefore revealed a weakness of character. More than just a digression of popularly held religious views, homosexuality deviated from the socially sanctioned heteronormality to such an extent that psychologists labeled it a mental illness. Within the context of the sex crime panic, popular narratives associated homosexuality with sexual psychopaths and with uncontrolled, compulsive sexual activity as well as the seduction of children. Government officials, like the popular media, often used the term “sex pervert” interchangeably with “homosexual” when they could overcome their discomfort to use any term at all.¹¹ Moreover, the public’s stereotype of homosexuals attributed them with characteristics like indiscretion, extreme emotional behavior, dishonesty,

¹⁰Brown, *Loyalty and Security*, 10.

¹¹For examples, see U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (28 March 1950) vol. 96, pt. 14, A2279; U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record* (24 April 1950) vol. 96, pt. 4, 5572-5577, 5581; U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record* (25 April 1950) vol. 96, pt. 5, 5748; U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (15 May 1950) vol. 96, pt. 15, A3661-2; U.S. Congress, *Congressional Record* (19 May 1950) vol. 96, pt. 6, 7329-30; U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (21

cliquishness, and indiscrimination in their choices of sexual partners.¹² Certainly, many Americans viewed homosexuals as contemptible individuals with great personal weaknesses.

The great social disdain for homosexuality and the penalty of unemployment increased the consequences of public disclosure of homosexual behavior.¹³ The assumption among government intelligence officers and officials that homosexuals were vulnerable to blackmail was both widespread and unquestioned. When journalist Max Lerner questioned several officials concerning what evidence supported such a view, in each case the reply was, “common sense.”¹⁴

Gossip columnists Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer published *Washington Confidential* in 1951 expressed the belief that homosexuals were untrustworthy. They closed a chapter on spies and wiretapping with the claim, “One of the benches in Lafayette Square, gathering place of the faggots, across from the White House, is wired up. You ought to hear some of the gay conversation. We did. Then we squirted penicillin in our ears.”¹⁵ Although the book was sensationalistic and tasteless, it sold more than 40,000 copies in the first three months of the year, stayed on the *New York*

September 1950) vol. 96, pt. 17, A6775-6; U.S. Congress, *Congress Record* (15 December 1950) vol. 96, pt. 12, 16587-8.

¹²U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (15 May 1950), A3661.

¹³David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 111.

¹⁴Max Lerner, “Scandal in the State Department,” *New York Post*, 14 July 1950, 2.

¹⁵Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer, *Washington Confidential* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1951), 25.

Times “Best Sellers” list for months, and was recognized by the newspaper as one of the top selling books of 1951.¹⁶

Although indiscreet heterosexual sexual behavior was similarly both immoral and made the perpetrator subject to blackmail through threats of exposure, society judged homosexuality more serious than philandering. An exchange between Carlisle Humelsine, Deputy Undersecretary of State, and Republican Senators Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa and Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire in 1953 illustrates the attitudes toward homosexuality:

Senator Hickenlooper: “Is it not generally a fact that most people consider addiction to sex abnormality as a rather crushing disgrace, if it gets out to the public?”

Mr. Humelsine: “Yes, sir.”

Senator Hickenlooper: “And, a greater disgrace, let us say, than if a man, for instance, would have a mistress?”

Mr. Humelsine: “There is no comparison.”

Senator Tobey: “In Washington?”

Mr. Humelsine: “Having a mistress is, while it might be wrong—“

Senator Tobey: “Expensive, they tell me.”

Mr. Humelsine: “It is a normal relationship.”

Senator Hickenlooper: “A relationship between the two.”

¹⁶*NYT*, “Washington After Dark,” April 1, 1951, 218; *NYT*, “The Best Sellers,” April 1, 1951, 206; *NYT*, “The Best Sellers,” April 8, 1951, 214; *NYT*, “The Best Sellers,” May 13, 1951, BR5, David Dempsey, “In and Out of Books,” *NYT*, May 27, 1951, 180; David Dempsey, “In and Out of Books,” *NYT*, March 25, 1951, 172; Orville Prescott, “Books of the Times,” *NYT*, December 7, 1951, 42; David Dempsey, “In and Out of Books,” *NYT*, December 30, 1951, BR5.

Mr. Humelsine: “You may get in dutch with your wife or friends, or may get bad newspaper publicity, and so forth, but I think when it comes down to a test of whether it is a question of being discovered or in the national interest, you will say, ‘Well, that would be too bad for me, I will catch hell from my wife, but that would just simply have to come out;’ but in these cases I think the illustration I gave is typical of their reactions.

Senator Hickenlooper: “As to the reaction of the normal kind, I suppose people think maybe they can live down something like the keeping of a mistress, and the perhaps bad publicity resulting from that, that will be gone and forgotten some day, but the sex abnormality, or the sex deviate, that is a thing that goes on, and they feel they would be forever disgraced, which often makes these sex people rather easy prey, once they get in the clutches of somebody who preys on that particular weakness.”

Mr. Humelsine: “It is a difficult thing, from another standpoint, to handle because we have had several of them that have done away with their lives after we have discharged them.”¹⁷

The claim that the Soviets possessed a master list of homosexuals working in the U.S. government affected the perceived seriousness of homosexuality as a security risk. Often repeated, the myth that the Soviets had captured such a list from the Nazis at the end of the Second World War, and that they used it to target homosexuals for the purposes of obtaining information from them, worked on multiple levels.¹⁸ Not only did the claim appeal to the same “common sense” argument that rendered all homosexuals vulnerable to blackmail, but also it implicitly reinforced the idea that all homosexuals were clannish, connected to one another in someway, or even belonged to

¹⁷U.S. Senate, “Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,” 83rd Congress, v. 5, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1953), 86-7.

¹⁸Max Lerner, “Scandal in the State Department,” *New York Post*, 16 July 1950, 2; U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (15 May 1950), A3661; Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (Amherst: University of

a single secret organization. In addition, it worked to conflate Soviets with Nazis by inferring that they used the same intelligence and espionage techniques to target homosexuals.

The findings of the Senate investigation into homosexuality and sexual perversion in the government, led by North Carolina Democrat Clyde Hoey and known as the Hoey Committee, conveyed these sentiments in 1950. Drawing on the metaphor of disease, the members wrote, “One homosexual can pollute a Government office.” More to the point, they asserted that a homosexual was unsuitable for federal employment because of “his tendency to gather other perverts around him,” and “it is almost inevitable that he will attempt to place other homosexuals in Government jobs.”¹⁹ Here again, the Hoey Committee reinforced the narrative that homosexual employees worked covertly to place other homosexuals in government positions and that the homosexual federal employees were connected to one another.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. reinforced the view that homosexuality was connected to communism in *The Vital Center*. In his book, published in 1949, he wrote that homosexuals, like communists, could identify one another through common speech patterns, interests, and acquaintances.²⁰ He described communists in blatantly sexual terms and, as historian Robert Dean contends, conveyed the message that “communism

Massachusetts Press, 2001), 77; K. A. Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 58.

¹⁹U.S. Senate, “Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government,” (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950), 4.

²⁰Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The Vital Center* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), 127, 151.

lay outside the boundaries of legitimate politics, just as homosexuality lay outside the boundaries of gender and sexuality; both were infantilizing subcultures of ‘deviance.’”²¹ In addition, Schlesinger introduced the sexualized, dichotomous language of “hard” and “soft” to describe one’s position on communism. The pragmatic, uncompromising liberal was “hard” while sentimental, utopian progressives who were sympathetic to communists and fellow travelers were “soft.”²²

Schlesinger not only branded those without a sufficiently tough attitude toward communists feminine but also impotent.²³ This dualistic interpretation of politics left no room for suggestions that relations with the Soviet Union might be conducted in a less hostile manner or that the internal communist threat might be dealt with in a less severe manner. Uttering such thoughts aloud left one open to charges of communism, doubts about one’s sexuality, and the attendant uncertainty about one’s mental health.

As K. A. Cuordileone points out, Henry Wallace, the Progressive third party presidential candidate in 1948, was the likely model for the “soft” liberal in *The Vital Center*. He had favored greater openness with the Soviet Union, opposed containment, and defended the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact as late as 1948.²⁴ Unlike Franklin Roosevelt, he had refused to renounce his campaign workers and supporters who were Communist Party members or fellow travelers.²⁵ The Truman administration and the

²¹Schlesinger, *The Vital Center*, 6, 88, 98, 133, 151, 160, 204, 241; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 69.

²²Schlesinger, *The Vital Center*, 36, 227.

²³Schlesinger, *The Vital Center*, 40, 46.

²⁴Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 27; Schlesinger, *The Vital Center*, 49.

²⁵Schlesinger, *The Vital Center*, 164.

Americans for Democratic Action pursued a strategy that portrayed Wallace as a naïve dupe of the communists.²⁶ Henry Wallace was so stigmatized that when he was summoned before Senator Pat McCarran's Internal Security Subcommittee, he required the aid of journalist Joseph Alsop to secure legal representation. Although Alsop was a "hard" anticommunist liberal, thirty lawyers refused the job before George Ball agreed to represent Wallace.²⁷

The issue of communism took center stage in the battle for the Democratic Party nomination for the U.S. Senator from Florida in 1950. The incumbent New Dealer Claude Pepper and the challenger George Smathers fought a vicious battle for the title that virtually guaranteed the Senate seat for the Southern single party state. Although Pepper ultimately lost the race because of his relatively liberal stance on race, Smathers often associated the Senator with communism in order to portray him as a radical. Pepper, at one point, had taken the position that Truman's policies on the Soviet Union were unnecessarily severe and he advocated a policy of patience and forbearance toward the communist nation that diverged markedly from the administration's policy of containment. Pepper had opposed Truman's nomination as the Democratic candidate for vice president in 1944 and for president in 1948. He launched a short-lived

²⁶Norman Markowitz, "A View from the Left: From the Popular Front to Cold War Liberalism," in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis (New York: New Viewpoints, 1974), 114.

²⁷George Ball, *The Past Has Another Pattern* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1982), 107-9; James A. Bill, *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 43; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 95.

presidential campaign in 1948 and even backed Henry Wallace and the Progressives.²⁸

In contrast, George Smathers was a veteran of the Second World War and a strict adherent to the Cold War ideology that was, according to his biographer Brian Lewis Crispell, “illustrative of his generation’s Cold War beliefs, judgments, and actions.”²⁹

Historians have suggested that Smathers' aggressive campaign inspired the tactics used by Richard Milhous Nixon against Helen Galaghan Douglas in the California Senatorial election and by Joseph R. McCarthy in his bid for re-election, both of which also occurred in 1950.³⁰ Smathers declared himself the protector of “Americanism” against forces that sought to destroy free enterprise. In this case, those forces included the advocates of civil rights, welfare programs, and communists. Employing the guilt-by-association technique so popular with red-baiters, Smathers used Pepper’s interview with Joseph Stalin in 1945 to suggest that the Senator was soft toward the Soviet Union. Similarly, a picture of Pepper with Paul Robeson appeared in a pro-Smathers pamphlet that listed the communist front organizations with which the Senator had been associated.³¹

A quote attributed to Smathers illustrates the tacit connection in the U.S. public mind between communism and sexual perversion that existed at the time of the election.

²⁸Brian Lewis Crispell, *Testing the Limits: George Armistead Smathers and Cold War America* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1999), 38-41.

²⁹Crispell, *Testing the Limits*, ix, 88.

³⁰Crispell, *Testing the Limits*, 54.

³¹Richard M. Fried, “Electoral Politics and McCarthyism: The 1950 Campaign,” in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis (New York: New Viewpoints, 1974), 196-7; David Cauter, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), 37; Crispell, 60, 62-63, 67.

In 1950, the small magazine *Quote* reported that Smathers, campaigning before a rural Florida audience, said:

Are you aware that Claude Pepper is known all over Washington as a shameless extrovert? Not only that, but this man is reliably reported to practice nepotism with his sister-in-law and he has a sister who was once a thespian in wicked New York. Worst of all, it is an established fact that Mr. Pepper, before his marriage, habitually practiced celibacy.³²

Time magazine reprinted the anecdote, and, even though the publication warned that the authenticity of the report was doubtful, authors from William F. Buckley, Jr. to Robert Sherrill cited the quote and it appeared in numerous articles.³³ Smathers denied making the remark and offered \$10,000 to anyone who could prove he did, but members of his campaign staff used the quote as one of many jokes designed to impeach Pepper's respectability.³⁴ Only because the belief was so pervasive that communism and sexual perversion were connected would the American public so readily believe, even over the objections of Smathers, that the statement was genuine. Because of that tacit connection, Smathers' staff perceived it to be effective against Pepper.

Adlai Stevenson became the Democratic nominee for president in 1952 when Truman announced he would not run. Stevenson, the liberal patrician Governor of

³²Howell Raines, "Legendary Campaign: Pepper vs. Smathers in '50," *NYT*, February 24, 1983, B8

³³Raines, "Legendary Campaign" February 24, 1983; *NYT*, "Naked Sesquipedalians," June 1, 1989, A22; *NYT*, "George A. Smathers, 93, Dies; Former Senator From Florida," January 21, 2007, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/21/us/21smathers.html>, retrieved on 1-22-2007; Matt Sedensky, "Former Sen. George Smathers Dies at 93," *Washington Post*, January 21, 2007, available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/21/AR2007012100143_pf.html, retrieved 1-22-2007; Crispell, *Testing the Limits*, 66-67. For one example of the use of the quote, see Fried, "Electoral Politics and McCarthyism," 196-7.

³⁴Raines, "Legendary Campaign" February 24, 1983.

Illinois, exemplified the image of the intellectual dupe popularly considered susceptible to communist manipulation. Stevenson had been a member of the New Deal bureaucracy. He also had had personal contacts with and had provided an affidavit attesting to the good character of Alger Hiss, the convicted perjurer whose trial proved, to those on the right, that Hiss had been involved in communist espionage and possibly homosexual activity.³⁵ In the first speech of Stevenson's campaign, he denounced McCarthyites.³⁶ Further, two Bradley University athletes accused of fixing basketball games reported to a New York City detective "that the two best known homosexuals in the state were [Bradley University] President [David] Owen and Governor Stevenson, and that Stevenson was known as 'Adeline.'" The detective forwarded this information to the FBI and on to Hoover who immediately opened Stevenson's sex deviate file. Hoover, no stranger to covert partisan maneuvers, directed FBI agents to discuss Stevenson's alleged homosexuality as well as the existence of an FBI report in public places with the intent of being overheard. Similarly, ex-FBI agents attempted to place the story in the official Republican biography of Stevenson.³⁷ *The New York Daily News* contributed to the effete portrayal of Stevenson when it called him "Adelaide," reported that he "trilled" his words, used "tea cup" words, and the subject of anticommunism sometimes made him "giggle."³⁸ Rumors regarding the candidate's

³⁵Dean, *The Imperial Brotherhood*, 154-6; Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 121; Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 88; Cauter, *The Great Fear*, 46-7.

³⁶Ball, *The Past Has a Different Pattern*, 126.

³⁷Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 154-6; Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 92.

³⁸Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 88.

sexuality also originated with his ex-wife who claimed that homosexuality was the real reason for their divorce. She, however, had been diagnosed with “persecutory paranoia” and so had little credibility.³⁹

When Stevenson ran for president again in 1956, the issue of his sexual persuasion was more pronounced. Rumors that Stevenson was a homosexual were so pervasive that some gay men considered him the “the first gay candidate for president.”

Walter Winchell, the famous gossip columnist and friend of Hoover, proclaimed on election night that, “A vote for Adlai Stevenson is a vote for Christine Jorgenson.”⁴⁰ Rumors regarding his sexuality damaged the image of Adlai Stevenson’s masculinity, which, in turn, created the idea that he was incapable of leading the country and dealing forcefully with the Soviet Union.

In a series of articles entitled “Scandal in the State Department” that he wrote for the *New York Post*, Max Lerner connected a perceived need for tough, virile diplomats in the atomic age with fears of homosexuals in the State Department. According to Lerner, a Harvard professor asserted that an effeminate man would simply be unable to handle the Soviets effectively.⁴¹ As the ideological conflict between the

³⁹Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 121. George Ball, a personal friend of Stevenson and worker on both Stevenson’s presidential campaigns, described Ellen Stevenson’s condition more generically as “psychotic.” Ball, *The Past Has a Different Pattern*, 112. Adlai Stevenson himself described the affliction as “persecutory paranoia” in a letter to Lady Mary Spears on June 15, 1955, Walter Johnson, Carol Evans and C. Eric Sears, ed., *The Papers of Adlai E. Stevenson, Volume IV, “Let’s Talk Some Sense to the American People,” 1952-1955* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 505.

⁴⁰ Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 121-2. Christine Jorgensen was famous at the time for being the first American male-to-female transsexual. For more on Christine Jorgensen, see Joanne Meyerowitz, “Transforming Sex: Christine Jorgensen in the Postwar U.S.,” *OAH Magazine of History* 20 (March 2006), 16-20.

⁴¹Lerner, “Scandal in the State Department,” July 16, 1950.

United States and the Soviet Union hardened into the Cold War, the role of diplomat became tantamount to that of a soldier on the frontline. In the United States, combat has been reserved exclusively for men as an arena in which men prove their masculinity. The exclusion of the feminine, either women or homosexual men, from combat served to preserve societal balance by maintaining dualistic masculine-feminine roles and definitions. In addition, the practice sustained the masculine representation of the country's governmental institutions.⁴² Therefore, homosexual State Department employees threatened the perceived efficacy of U.S. foreign relations and also jeopardized the country's societal configuration.

Not only did homosexuals lack the masculine qualities necessary to fight communism, they were inclined toward communism. The Hill-Wherry Committee, yet another Senate investigation begun in 1950 as members of Congress raced to condemn homosexuality and gain politically from the issue, gathered testimony "proving" that homosexuals in the employ of the federal government endangered national security. Before the committee, a member of the District of Columbia Communism Squad testified that, in his opinion, drawing on his experience observing communist meetings, "a pervert is very susceptible" to communism.⁴³ This view justified the effort to rid the government of homosexuals with the same urgency as ridding it of communists.

While legislators and government officials were concerned with homosexuals in

⁴²Susan Jeffords, *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 60; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 38.

⁴³Lerner, "Scandal in the State Department," July 16, 1950.

all federal departments, the State Department was the primary symbol for this issue. As Undersecretary of State Carlisle Humelsine stated before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1953 in relation to homosexuality, “in the public mind, it seems to be a psychological illness or sickness generally associated with the Foreign Service and the Department of State.”⁴⁴ Washington insiders were not alone in this view.

Lait and Mortimer wrote an entire chapter about homosexuals in addition to the multiple references to them throughout *Washington Confidential*. They devoted much of “Garden of Pansies” to the inordinate number of homosexuals they believed to be in the State Department. Lait and Mortimer claimed, “the YMCA is vetoing the use of its facilities, especially the swimming pool, to all State Department employees, just to be on the safe side” and “the government is honeycombed in high places with people you wouldn’t let in your garbage wagons.”⁴⁵ Lait and Mortimer reinforced the narrative that the State Department was full of homosexuals.

The author of one of the most comprehensive contemporary examinations of the loyalty and security system in the country confirmed the widespread perception that the State Department was home to an inordinate number of homosexuals. Yale law professor Ralph S. Brown, Jr. wrote in 1958 that it was the, “common opinion that the State Department has for some reason attracted colonies of homosexuals.”⁴⁶ The Alger Hiss case and Joseph McCarthy’s initial, headline-grabbing allegations against the

⁴⁴U.S. Senate, “Executive Session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,” 70.

⁴⁵Lait and Mortimer, *Washington Confidential*, 90-98.

⁴⁶Brown, *Loyalty and Security*, 258.

department worked to tarnish its image with American public. Both of these events merged communism with homosexuality and played on larger issues of class and gender within society.

To the political right, Alger Hiss was the consummate Eastern establishment intellectual New Dealer internationalist whose wealth and privilege had cultivated “softness.” His elite education at John Hopkins and Harvard Law School, sponsorship by Judge Felix Frankfurter, and experience as a law clerk under Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes incurred the scorn and suspicion of the right. He worked in the New Deal apparatus for the Agriculture Adjustment Administration, moved on to the Nye Committee, and to a position with the solicitor general, remaining in each position for only a brief period. He joined the State Department in the 1930s where he fulfilled a minor role at the Yalta Conference, served as executive secretary at Dumbarton Oaks, and principal advisor to the American delegation at the San Francisco Charter Conference at the United Nations. In 1947, Hiss was appointed to the Presidency of the Carnegie Endowment for World Peace.⁴⁷

Hiss’ resume reflected the Democratic movement toward international and domestic intervention unsuccessfully opposed by Republicans during Roosevelt’s administration. More important, however, as tensions with the Soviet Union sharpened in the postwar world, the Republican charge that the Democrats had been naïve, or even

⁴⁷Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 73; Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 41; Caute, *The Great Fear*, 58-9; G. Edward White, *Alger Hiss’s Looking Glass Wars: The Covert Life of a Soviet Spy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 12-13, 21, 35-6,44.

treasonous, to bargain with the Soviets during the Second World War gained traction. As former communists confessed and espionage trials revealed the vulnerabilities of a free society, Republicans demanded to know who was responsible for placing spies in strategic places. Republicans used the phrase “twenty years of treason” to indict the Democrats for their foreign policy decisions and their “lax” loyalty and security procedures. Alger Hiss was symbolic of the Eastern establishment bureaucrats who served in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. However, Hiss’ symbolism took on even more significance in 1948 when Whittaker Chambers accused him of being a communist before the House Un-American Activities Committee.⁴⁸

Chambers was by 1948 a devout Catholic and an anti-communist but he confessed to the FBI that homosexual encounters had followed the commencement of his career as a communist agent. He claimed that he “conquered” both his homosexual and communist “afflictions” simultaneously. Chambers’ confession, the narrative of a married man furtively seeking homosexual experiences, was replete with the discourse of compulsion and depravity that brought the narratives of communism and homosexuality together.⁴⁹

⁴⁸Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 72-74; Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 23, 42; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 33. Frank C. Waldrop’s “The Biggest Story” maintained that “two demons from hell [Hitler and Stalin]—one of whom President F. D. Roosevelt chose above the other, when he need not have touched either,” “the Communists in this country were not really a fully developed political and conspiratorial force until 1934. They got their growth under the patronage of F. D. Roosevelt,” and “The President of the United States had by then [1934] let the Communists in on the Government itself.” Although extreme examples of partisan communist smear tactics, FDR’s cousin, New York Representative and Republican Katherine St. George read Waldrop’s articles into the *Appendix to the Congressional Record* in multiple installments. *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (15 May 1950), A3641-2; *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (19 May 1950) vol.96, pt.15, A3810.

⁴⁹Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 42; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 33; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 74; Allen Weinstein, *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case* (New York:

Precisely because of his liberal elite background, Alger Hiss was a political prize. His guilt was largely a forgone conclusion to those on the political right and served as an issue for dividing those on the left into “hard” and “soft” liberals. First-term California Congressman Richard M. Nixon gained notoriety and credibility from his efforts to “get” Hiss while many influential liberals, most notably Secretary of State Dean Acheson, suffered from their refusal to distance themselves from him.⁵⁰

Because the statute of limitations had expired for espionage, Hiss was tried twice for perjury, with the first trial ending in a mistrial. Although Hiss maintained that he had known Chambers only briefly and superficially in the 1930s as David Crosely, Chambers possessed detailed knowledge of the Hiss home in Georgetown. Further, Chambers insisted that Hiss had passed government documents to him, even producing samples hidden in pumpkins on the Chambers farm.⁵¹

The trial was permeated with a sexual subtext due to Chambers’ sexual disclosures, which were confidential but still widely circulated.⁵² The disparate backgrounds and appearances of Hiss and Chambers contributed to perceptions that

Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 118-9, 399-400, 584. Although Chambers confessed his homosexual encounters to the FBI immediately before the Hiss perjury trial began in 1949, he only discretely referenced the rumors regarding his sexual past in his autobiography *Witness*, published in 1952. He wrote, “Sooner or later in this book, I must unavoidably take note of the slanders which at one time or another, as best suited their purposes, the Hiss forces have spread about my relations with every member of the Hiss household. [...] Those slanders were part of an international whispering campaign, probably originated and spread by the Communist Party [...] Unqualifiedly, the slanders are lies,” Whittaker Chambers, *Witness* (New York: Random House, 1952), 374.

⁵⁰Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 41; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 73-4; Caute, *The Great Fear*, 42-44, 46, 58-61; Weinstein, *Perjury*, 509-510; Chambers, *Witness*, 605-6, 789-90.

⁵¹Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 31-32; Caute, *The Great Fear*, 59-60

⁵²Weinstein, *Perjury*, 583-4.

their past connection must have involved communism or homosexuality since they would have had nothing else in common. However, Hiss' defense team never directly confronted Chambers concerning his homosexual past or contended with rumors that Hiss and Chambers, Hiss' stepson and Chambers, or even Hiss' wife and Chambers had been at one time or another involved in an affair. Although Alger Hiss privately suggested that the accusations against him were motivated by unrequited homosexual attraction on Chambers' part, Hiss' defense team feared that referencing the subject would only cause the jury to associate it with him. Further, Hiss refused to allow his stepson to testify to facts vital to the case since he had been discharged from the military for psychiatric reasons including homosexuality.⁵³ The sexual subtext shaped the defense's strategy, constraining it from presenting all available witnesses and information that might have persuaded the jury to find Hiss not guilty. While Hiss was convicted of perjury, the conviction served as a de facto espionage conviction since he was convicted of lying about his associations with a confessed communist agent.

Chambers' accusations, the trials, and the resulting publicity not only damaged Hiss' reputation but also the reputations of many respected liberals who had supported him. Supreme Court Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley M. Reed and Appeals Court Judge Calvert Magruder appeared as character witnesses while Adlai Stevenson submitted a deposition attesting to Hiss' good character.⁵⁴ During the hearings on Dean

⁵³Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 74-5; Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture*, 42-44; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 32-33; Weinstein, *Perjury*, 117-9, 165-8, 399-400, 582-4.

⁵⁴*Dallas Morning News*, "Two Justices Defending Hiss," June 24, 1949, Sec I, 6; *Dallas Morning News*, "Character Witness," July 22, 1949, Sec I, 2.

Acheson's confirmation as Secretary of State, Acheson freely acknowledged his associations with Hiss and, on the day of Hiss' conviction, Acheson stated, "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss."⁵⁵ Although judges who had defended Hiss suffered media scrutiny, they were protected from Congressional attack by the principles of judicial independence.⁵⁶ Acheson and Stevenson were not so lucky.

Outraged by Acheson's statement of loyalty to Hiss, Republican legislators assailed Acheson. They immediately called for Acheson's resignation, insisting that his attitude toward Alger Hiss proved that he was unfit for government service.⁵⁷ Truman refused to remove Acheson but, as Senator Styles Bridges disclosed to a reporter, "Acheson's statement that he would not turn his back on Hiss, despite the latter's perjury conviction, has aroused congressional curiosity about the present security of State Department documents." Although Acheson insisted that he "did not[...]condone in any way the offenses charged against Alger Hiss and[...]would never knowingly tolerate any disloyal person in the State Department," this issue provided a platform for the Republican Congress to question not only the Truman administration's Loyalty and

⁵⁵Westbrook Pegler, "Acheson and Frankfurter Sponsors of Alger Hiss," *Dallas Morning News*, January 12, 1949, section II, 3; *Dallas Morning News*, "Acheson Gets Chance Today to State Views," January 13, 1949, section I, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, "Acheson Backs Convicted Hiss," January 26, 1950, part I, 1; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 73-4; Chambers, *Witness*, 741.

⁵⁶Drew Pearson, "Frankfurter, Influence For Both Good and Bad," *Dallas Morning News*, February 2, 1950, part III, 5.

⁵⁷*Dallas Morning News*, "GOP Demands For Firing of Acheson Grows," January 29, 1950, part I, 17; *Dallas Morning News*, "Senate Slaps Dean Acheson," February 22, 1950, part I, 7; Cate, *The Great Fear*, 37.

Security programs, but also the formulation of State Department policy on a number of fronts, especially China.⁵⁸

When Acheson appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee only a few months after Hiss' conviction, Senator Bridges questioned him on the different types of security risks. In the course of these questions, Senator Bridges directly implied that he, Secretary of State Acheson, was himself a security risk because of his defense of Alger Hiss. Although Acheson responded with a prepared statement that was, at least momentarily, satisfactory, Acheson and Hiss remained connected in the public mind and the Hiss case continued to affect the formation of security policy throughout the 1950s.⁵⁹

Through his defense of Hiss, Acheson, like other men of his standing, was fulfilling the requirements of masculinity as defined by his social class. Acheson defended his loyalty to Hiss by claiming that he felt "constrained by Christian principles to stand by the man he once called his friend."⁶⁰ Both Acheson and Hiss were elite establishment patricians who, although not close friends, had parallel careers moving up through the government service apparatus and were bound by similar experiences.

⁵⁸*Dallas Morning News*, "Acheson Apt to Face Quiz on Loyalties," February 6, 1950, part I, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, "Dean Acheson Says He Doesn't Condone Alger Hiss Offenses," March 1, 1950, part I, 12; *NYT*, "The Nation," 16 March 1950; *NYT*, "Abroad," March 20, 1950.

⁵⁹Drew Pearson, "Acheson Faces Bridges In Test on Hiss Matter," *Dallas Morning News*, March 8, 1950, part III, 5; Ray Tucker, "Shadowy Hiss Figures In Greater Safeguards," *Dallas Morning News*, May 7, 1953, part II, 1; *Dallas Morning News*, "Ex-Aid Says Reds Affect State Department Affairs," June 26, 1953, part I, 4; *Time*, "Act of Humiliation," (March 13, 1950), 17; William S. White, "Never Condoned Disloyalty, Says Acheson of Hiss Stand," *NYT*, March 1, 1950, 1-2; Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: W.W. Norton, Inc., 1969), 360-1.

⁶⁰*Dallas Morning News*, "Acheson Backs Convicted Hiss," January 26, 1950; *Dallas Morning News*, "Acheson Apt to Face Quiz on Loyalties," February 6, 1950; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 360.

Others of his class praised and respected Acheson for refusing to bow to political pressure and deny his association with Alger Hiss. In this respect, his peers saw Acheson as braving political warfare for a friend and proving his manhood.⁶¹

But for anyone who was not a member of the eastern establishment, Acheson's refusal to repudiate Hiss appeared to be evidence of a "conspiracy of the gentlemen" that played into longstanding suspicions about the State Department and class resentments.⁶² As the country's link with the rest of the world, the State Department had attracted the hostility of the U.S. public and Congress at least since the beginning of the twentieth century. Caught in the struggle between isolationists and interventionists, the State Department was the subject of narratives that depicted the organization as filled with the villain of the day.⁶³ In the context of the sex crime scare and tensions with the Soviet Union, those villains were homosexuals and communists.

Philip Wylie's *Generation of Vipers*, written in 1942, reflected feelings of antipathy and misgivings connected to class with which many Americans looked upon the State Department. He wrote, "they have a franchise" and "they are fake Englishmen, without the knowledge or an understanding of the positive qualities of a Briton." He also wrote, "Most of them are sissies[...]and in American statecraft, where you need desperately a man of iron, you often get a nance." In 1955, Wylie added in the newly annotated edition, "It was not McCarthy who made, ten years after this was

⁶¹Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 73-4; Weinstein, *Perjury*, 506; Acheson, *Present at the Creation*, 360.

⁶²Weinstein, *Perjury*, 505-7; Cate, *The Great Fear*, 42-3.

⁶³DeMarchee Bess, "Why Americans Hate the State Department," *Saturday Evening Post*, 23.

noted down, the findings about homosexuality in the State Department,” and “the sissies and dopes in [the] State [Department] here noted were, nearly all, Ivy League graduates, West Pointers, Annapolis men, or the Roman Catholic sons of Georgetown.”⁶⁴ Wylie, in 1942, linked the patrician characteristics and backgrounds of many State Department officials to the notion of cliquishness, pretentiousness, and homosexuality. He reinforced those concepts in the new edition of his book by explicitly referencing the elite educations and homosexuality popularly associated with the State Department by 1955.

The influential Sociologist Edward Shils wrote in 1956 that the alarm over subversion in the post-World War II years was merely a new permutation of the conflict between politicians and intellectuals that had been occurring since the first half of the nineteenth century.⁶⁵ Shils claimed that the perception of politics and society as ruled by hidden factions was characteristic of modern societies.⁶⁶ He pointed to populism, as a philosophy that “exists wherever there is an ideology of popular resentment against the order imposed on society by a long-established, differentiated ruling class, which is believed to have a monopoly of power, property, breeding, and culture,” to explain the attitude of hostility toward the wealthy, the highly educated, and the bureaucrat.⁶⁷ Shils’ thesis is supported by a *Saturday Evening Post* editorial claiming that federal

⁶⁴Philip Wylie, *Generation of Vipers*, new annotated edition, (New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1955), 248-9.

⁶⁵Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy: The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies*, (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1956), 13.

⁶⁶Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy*, 27-33.

⁶⁷Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy*, 98-104.

employees were the new “special privilege boys” and that quoted a recent edition of *Human Events* to claim that civil servants not only held the old perquisites of wealth but also the power to direct American society.⁶⁸

Joseph McCarthy, only one of many politicians to do so, exploited populist resentments in order to attain fame and power.⁶⁹ Speaking in Wheeling, West Virginia on February 9, 1950 and again on the Senate floor on February 20, 1950, Senator McCarthy charged that the State Department was “infested with communists.” He highlighted cases of alleged communists in policymaking positions, some of whom he claimed were protected by high-ranking State Department officials. In his Wheeling speech, McCarthy cast

the elite as traitors declaring:

it has not been the less fortunate or members of minority groups who have been selling this Nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer—the finest homes, the finest college education, and the finest jobs in Government we can give. That is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been the worst.⁷⁰

The Senator repeated the charges in a speech before the Marine Corps League in April 1950.⁷¹

Not content to indict the State Department in general, McCarthy targeted Secretary of State Acheson specifically. The Wheeling speech, only a few weeks after

⁶⁸*Saturday Evening Post*, “The New Princes of Privilege are the Bureaucrats,” October 6, 1951, 10.

⁶⁹Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy*, 103-4.

⁷⁰*Congressional Record* (20 February 1950) v.96, part 2, 1952-1954, 58.

⁷¹*NYT*, “M’Carthy Avoids Spy Charges in Talk Outside Congress,” April 9, 1950.

the Hiss conviction, not only expounded upon Hiss' sins but also condemned Acheson's loyalty.⁷² Playing on populist resentments, McCarthy told the West Virginia crowd, "When the pompous diplomat in striped pants, with a phony British accent, proclaimed to the American people that Christ on the Mount endorsed communism, high treason, and the betrayal of a sacred trust, the blasphemy was so great that it awakened the dormant indignation of the American people."⁷³

In his zeal to connect with common Americans and demonize the privileged, McCarthy took special aim at the highly educated. In the Wheeling speech, on the Senate floor, and again speaking to the Marine Corps League, he blamed a group of "twisted" and "warped" intellectuals not only for the perceived security problems in the State Department but also in the U.S. political system and, therefore, the politically motivated charges of foreign policy failures. He claimed at different times on the same day on the Senate floor that, "a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals have taken over both the Democratic and Republican Parties to try to wrest control from them," and "I think the Democratic Party has lost control of the executive branch. An unusual group of people—a group of twisted-thinking intellectuals—has taken over the State Department, in recent years." He further asserted that, "President Truman [...] is merely a prisoner of a bunch of twisted intellectuals who tell him what they want him to

⁷²*NYT*, "Hiss Guilty on Both Perjury Counts, Betrayal of US Secrets Affirmed; Sentence Wednesday; Limit 10 Years," January 22, 1950, 1; *NYT*, "Alger Hiss Guilty As Charged," January 22, 1950, 127.

⁷³*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1957.

know.”⁷⁴ While McCarthy continually affirmed that the majority of rank and file State Department employees were loyal and decent Americans, he worked to isolate high-ranking State Department officials and present them as alien, casting them in the role as an unfamiliar other, with whom Americans could not identify but rather regarded with suspicion.

On the Senate floor in February 1950, McCarthy offered brief descriptions of eighty-one people who currently or previously worked for the State Department, “so that anyone who reads the *Record* will have a good idea of the number of communists in the State Department.” The Senator himself acknowledged that he did not know whether many of his examples of “known communists” in the State Department were even still on the government payroll. However, the fact that they were ever there, even if their removal would demonstrate the successful functioning of President Truman’s Loyalty Program, still “proved” that the State Department was “infested with communists” since, as he pointed out, communists, once hired, usually recommended other communists for government jobs.⁷⁵

As McCarthy described his cases, not all of his examples proved to be communists. Case number fourteen was “flagrantly homosexual” and, according to McCarthy, he had information indicating that a high-ranking State Department official had gone to great lengths in an effort to protect this individual’s job, even attempting to

⁷⁴*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1953, 1957, 1959, 1968; *NYT*, “M’Carthy Avoids Spy Charge in Talk Outside Congress,” April 9, 1950, 1.

⁷⁵*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1958-9, 1966.

persuade other employees to retract affidavits regarding his sexuality. Although the Senator alleged that the individual was closely connected to other homosexuals and to others associated with communist organizations, the individual himself was not charged with being a communist. Nonetheless, McCarthy went on to explain that, according to a “top intelligence man,” “practically every active communist is twisted mentally or physically in some way.”⁷⁶ Case number sixty-two similarly involved homosexuals. As McCarthy described it, the case was “not important insofar as communistic activities[...]but[...]because it sheds light on some rather unusual mental aberration of certain individuals in the State Department.” He further asserted that, “it gives a rather interesting picture of some rather unusual mental twists of these gentlemen who are tied up with Communistic organizations.”⁷⁷ The belief that communists were “twisted” allowed homosexuals, already conceived of as psychopaths, to be easily assumed to be communists, and vice versa. McCarthy’s use of the term “twisted” in connection with communists and homosexuals was the same as his use of the term in relation to intellectuals, as if members of each group were related and interchangeable.

McCarthy’s charges caught the attention of the U.S. public. Citizens displayed their disapproval of communists and homosexuals in the State Department by writing letters to the Senator, other legislators, and the White House. Even though only two of McCarthy’s eighty-one cases concerned homosexuals, three quarters of the letters to the Senator condemned “sexual depravity” in the State Department, while the other one

⁷⁶*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1961.

⁷⁷*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1978-9; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 15-6.

quarter were concerned with communist infiltration.⁷⁸ As one *Dallas Morning News* columnist wrote, “Analysis of the 3,000 letter Senator McCarthy has received since he first assailed the State Department reveals as much concern across the country over infiltration of homosexuals as worry over homo-Stalinists.”⁷⁹ In the context of the sex crime panic, fear among the U.S. population of the presence of homosexuals in positions of power outweighed concerns of communist infiltration and was clearly an attractive issue for Republicans.

The Hiss conviction and McCarthy coverage brought full Congressional attention to the issues of communism and homosexuality in the State Department by the end of March 1950. The statement by Republican Representative William Hill illustrates the political rhetoric used to take partisan advantage of the controversy. He stated on March 28, 1950:

In considering the employment by the State and Commerce Departments of bad security risks, who is to blame for the employing of this type of person in the first place? Whether they are soft-shouldered on Russia, believe in appeasement, or are homosexuals, the question in my mind is why is such a type of citizen considered for these top positions when there are so many good Americans that we could employ. It would be interesting to know who promotes the hiring of such misfits.”⁸⁰

Hill’s statement reveals the partisan political strategy of blaming the heads of executive departments, especially Dean Acheson, for hiring decisions, some made even before they were appointed to their positions that emerged from McCarthy’s allegations.

⁷⁸Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 19.

⁷⁹Victor Riesel, “Victor Riesel,” *Dallas Morning News*, March 28, 1950, Part III, 5.

⁸⁰*Appendix to the Congressional Record* (March 28, 1950), A2279.

Within his statement is also the merging of communists and homosexuals into a single type of person, a “misfit,” clearly distinguished from “good Americans.”

In early March, in the same session of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriation in which Republican Senator Styles Bridges implied that Secretary of State Acheson was himself a security risk due to his loyalty to Alger Hiss, Undersecretary of State John Peurifoy testified that 202 State Department employees had resigned in the midst of loyalty investigations since 1947. He further admitted, after prodding, that 91 of these employees were homosexuals. While *Time* termed this “revelation” as “shocking,” the senators probably did not find it either a revelation or shocking.⁸¹ As historian David K. Johnson points out, only the previous month, Peurifoy had given them the same information but in a closed session, away from the media, and without the opportunity to gain political capital from embarrassing both the Truman administration and the State Department.⁸²

Historians contend that Peurifoy’s admission set off the Lavender Scare.⁸³ Unlike Dean Acheson, who came from wealth and privilege, John Peurifoy was a poor Southerner who began his government career as an elevator operator. With a reputation for being direct and knowledgeable, members of Congress regarded him favorably. As Republican Representative John Taber remarked, “I don’t like any of those bastards from the State Department. They come up here and they lie and they hedge and they

⁸¹*Time*, “Act of Humiliation,” 17.

⁸²Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 17-8.

⁸³Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 20; Cuordileone, “Manhood and American Political Culture,” 49-50; Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 76; John D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The*

don't know what they're talking about. All except Jack Peurifoy.”⁸⁴ Peurifoy's positive relationship with Congress produced a discreet collaboration between himself and some members of the appropriations committee beginning in 1947 to remove homosexuals from the State Department. However, after McCarthy's charges began making newspaper headlines, those Congressmen were no longer interested in being discreet.⁸⁵

Throughout March 1950, the war of words between McCarthy and the State Department intensified. With the recall of John S. Service from India to answer McCarthy's loyalty charges, Peurifoy defended Service and denounced McCarthy's tactics.⁸⁶ McCarthy fired back, asserting that Peurifoy, in his defense of Service, had already mandated that he be cleared and the matter “white-washed.”⁸⁷ Although Acheson insisted that he welcomed the investigation of McCarthy's charges, a *New York Times* columnist noted that it “was part of a campaign against the Secretary of State,” who was under attack for being both “too ‘soft’ on communism,” and “too rigid in rejecting proposals for a new approach to Russia.”⁸⁸ By the end of the month,

Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 41-2.

⁸⁴Hugh Morrow, “He's De-Snobbing the State Department,” *Saturday Evening Post*, (August 27, 1949), 25, 116.

⁸⁵Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 22-3.

⁸⁶William S. White, “State Department Recalls Indian Aide for Loyalty Check,” *NYT*, March 16, 1950, 1; William S. White, “M'Carthy's Tactics ‘A Shame, Disgrace,’ Peurifoy Declares,” *NYT*, March 17, 1950, 1; *NYT*, “Text of Peurifoy Statement on Service,” March 17, 1950, 10.

⁸⁷*NYT*, “M'Carthy Charges Peurifoy Mandate,” March 18, 1950, 7.

⁸⁸*NYT*, “The Nation,” March 19, 1950, F1; *NYT*, “Abroad,” March 20, 1950; William S. White, “Acheson ‘Welcomes’ Inquiry; G.O.P. Shuns ‘Red’ Charges,” *NYT*, March 23, 1950, 1, 13.

Republican Senators Styles Bridges and William Jenner of Indiana were leading a campaign to remove Acheson from office.⁸⁹

As McCarthy's "war" with the State Department gathered steam, the Senator gained the support of the Republican National Committee. In a letter distributed to 7,000 party workers and the press, Guy Gabrielson, Republican National Chairman, wrote, "As Americans, it is difficult for us to believe that a National Administration would go to such lengths to cover up and protect subversives, traitors, working against their country in high Governmental places." Although Gabrielson never named McCarthy specifically, he continued with McCarthy's familiar argument, "Perhaps as dangerous as the actual communists are the sexual perverts who have infiltrated government in recent years. The State Department has confessed that it has had to fire ninety-one of these."⁹⁰ With the sanction of the RNC, partisan attacks on the State Department and Acheson intensified.

While personally under assault, Acheson went on the offensive to defend the State Department. In a radio address at a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April 1950, the Secretary of State sought to "clear away some trash which has gathered about the Department of State." He declared that, "the Department is manned today, as it has been manned in the past, by able, honorable, by

⁸⁹*Dallas Morning News*, "G.O.P. Bloc Drives to Oust Acheson," March 28, 1950, part 1, 1; William S. White, "M'Carthy is Asked By Tydings to Yield Evidence on 'Reds,'" *NYT*, April 5, 1950, 1, 18.

⁹⁰*NYT*, "Perverts Called Government Peril," April 19, 1950, 25.

loyal, and by clean-living Americans men and women.”⁹¹ His remarks immediately drew fire from Republican Senators. Senator Karl Mundt remarked, “It would appear that Mr. Acheson could find a better criterion by which to judge those now in his department than to say that they conform in clean living with those in the Department earlier.”⁹²

But, while Acheson and the State Department were public whipping boys for the homosexuals-in-government issue, their “success” was used on the floor of Congress to brow beat other executive departments. In March 1950, Bernard Gladieux, executive assistant secretary to the Secretary of Commerce, reported to Democratic Representative John Rooney that the Department of Commerce had failed to uncover any homosexuals among the 46,000 Commerce Department employees. Representative Rooney found this fact “incredible” and responded, “We have not had the cooperation from you that we had from the State Department.”⁹³ This exchange illustrates both that Democratic legislators heeded the political importance of the issue and that the demand to remove homosexuals from the government payroll quickly spread from the State Department.

The testimony of Lieutenant Roy Blick, head of the Washington D.C. Vice Squad, before the Wherry Committee energized the Lavender Scare. Lieutenant Blick

⁹¹*Appendix to the Congressional Record*, (April 24, 1950), A2933; *NYT*, “Acheson Said To Be On Offensive Against ‘Mad’ McCarthy Charges,” April 23, 1950, 1.

⁹²*Congressional Record*, (April 24, 1950), 5572.

⁹³John O’Donnell, “Capitol Stuff,” reprinted in *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (March 28, 1950), A2279.

testified that there were 5,000 homosexuals in Washington D.C., 3,750 of whom were government employees. Of those 3,750, the State Department was home to 300 to 400 homosexuals. Blick acknowledged that the figures given were “a quick guess” based on his nineteen years of experience.⁹⁴ However, when later questioned by journalist Max Lerner, Blick revealed a complex and questionable system of both counting the “contacts” revealed by arrested homosexuals and multiplying the total number of arrested homosexuals by five in order to arrive at the total of 5,000. He then estimated that three quarters of the homosexuals worked for the government and gave the Senators the number of 3,750 homosexual federal employees.⁹⁵

Blick’s status as an expert on homosexual behavior, the very existence of Blick’s list, and his estimation of the number of homosexuals in Washington D.C. makes little sense outside the context of the sex crime panic. The passage in 1948 of the Miller Sexual Psychopath Law not only played on the narrative of homosexuals as a threat to children but also heightened the criminalization of adult consensual behavior. In addition, Washington D.C. and U.S. Park Police began to target homosexuals more aggressively. Even in cases lacking the evidence to file criminal charges, the authorities recorded the suspected homosexuals’ names, occupations, fingerprints, and photographs into a “pervert file.”⁹⁶

⁹⁴William S. White, “Inquiry By Senate On Perverts Asked,” *NYT*, May 20, 1950, 8; *Dallas Morning News*, “Senate Body Seeks Probe of Perverts,” May 20, 1950, Part I, 1, 6.

⁹⁵Max Lerner, “Scandal in the State Dept. VIII—Blick of the Vice Squad,” *New York Post*, July 18, 1950, 2, 26.

⁹⁶Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 58-9.

Although Blick downplayed his sums as only a guess and his methodology left much to be desired, the new data provided members of Congress with the means to inflate the rhetoric of the Lavender Scare. Republican Representative Arthur Lewis Miller, sponsor of the Miller Sexual Psychopath Law and himself a physician, speaking before the Nebraska State Medical Association, made reference to Blick's statistics, the legendary Nazi list of homosexuals, and erroneously stated that, "the Russians and Orientals still look upon the practice [homosexuality] with favor." He continued on to associate homosexuality with intellectuals. He claimed that homosexuals were pathological, liars, violently jealous, and unfit for military service. Alleging that homosexuals were, like women, inherently unstable, Miller asserted that:

the cycle of these individuals' homosexuals' desires follow the cycle closely patterned to the menstrual cycle period of women. There may be 3 or 4 days in each month that this homosexual's instinct breaks down and drive the individual into abnormal fields of sexual practice[...]if the individual can be given large doses of sedatives or other treatments[...]he may escape performing acts of homosexuality.⁹⁷

Along with the political speeches, legislators, armed with Blick's statistics, called for investigations. Republican Senator Kenneth Wherry and Democrat Lister Hill sought an investigation into the employment of homosexuals by the Federal government.⁹⁸ Although Democratic Senator Millard Tydings, himself a member of the privileged elite and the son-in-law of Ambassador Joseph Davies, author of the much

⁹⁷*Appendix to the Congressional Record*, (May 15, 1950), A3661, for information on the Soviet treatment of homosexuals, see Laura Engelstein, "Soviet Policy Toward Male Homosexuality: Its Origins and Historical Roots," *Journal of Homosexuality* 29 (1995), 155-173; Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 58.

⁹⁸*NYT*, "Inquiry By Senate On Perverts Asked," May 20, 1950, 8, *Dallas Morning News*, "Senate Body Seeks Probe of Perverts," May 20, 1950.

reviled *Mission to Moscow*, had immediately launched an inquiry into McCarthy's allegations in the hopes of undercutting the Senator. The conservative press and members of Congress ridiculed his findings as a whitewash.⁹⁹

For a new round of investigation, Senator Clyde Hoey of North Carolina was selected to lead the inquiry after McCarthy declined the position. Senator Hoey, a septuagenarian Southern Legislator who had first been elected to Congress in 1898, viewed homosexuality in religious terms. He also experienced discomfort discussing it and believed that the presence of a woman, Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, would be detrimental to the process of discovery. He felt too embarrassed to ask questions of the experts presented to the committee. At one point, having never heard of female homosexuals and unable to conceive of how they might interact sexually, Hoey asked Francis Flanagan, the committee's chief counsel, to explain it to him. Seeking to keep the investigation from devolving into a circus, Hoey kept it behind closed doors.¹⁰⁰

In December 1950 when the Hoey Committee released its findings, it ignored much of the testimony and evidence that it had seen. Instead, the final report confirmed the claims, even with little evidence to support them, that homosexuals were vulnerable to blackmail, a threat to the nation's security, and, therefore, unsuitable for government employment. Further, they were criminals and mentally unstable and their moral

⁹⁹Lynn Landrum, "Thinking Out Loud," *Dallas Morning News*, July 20, 1950, Part III, 3; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 25-28.

¹⁰⁰Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 101-114.

weakness was corrosive to the work environment. Reflecting the popular belief that homosexuals corrupted the youth, the report claimed that homosexuals in the workplace were particularly harmful to younger workers. Because homosexuals were cliquish, they would only attempt to place more homosexuals in positions around them. The committee recommended that departments begin aggressive action to identify and fire homosexuals using established regulations against immoral conduct. It connected homosexual federal employees to the larger sex crime panic by calling for more rigorous enforcement of the Miller Sexual Psychopath law in Washington D.C.¹⁰¹ The Hoey Committee, conducted quietly and without the theatrics of the McCarthy investigations, seemed restrained and enlightened in the cultural context. Historian David K. Johnson makes the argument that it was at this point that the Lavender Scare moved out of the realm of partisan tactics, acquired bilateral backing, and became government policy.¹⁰²

From the beginning of Truman's loyalty program, the judgment of a federal employee's loyalty often rested on security concerns, and homosexuality was a significant risk. The movement of U.S. government officials, intellectuals, and the media to connect communism and homosexuality reflected the dominant narrative within U.S. society that attributed similar characteristics to members of those groups. In the same way and at the time that local, state, and federal politicians enacted more

¹⁰¹U.S. Senate, "Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government," 2-4, 8-9, 15-19.

¹⁰²Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 114-117.

stringent legislation aimed at homosexuals in response to the sex crime panic, members of the U.S. Congress pressed to remove them from the federal payroll. However, while the purges of homosexuals and communists from the federal government were originally enmeshed, the persecution of homosexual employees lasted long after the concern with communists faded.

CHAPTER 5

THE COMPLEX DIMENSIONS OF THE LAVENDER SCARE

The purge of homosexuals from the State Department, known as the Lavender Scare, caused personal and professional devastation to countless individuals and affected the functioning of the agency. However, the Lavender Scare also provoked homosexuals to unite in opposition to discriminatory policies.

Senator Joseph McCarthy acknowledged, as he was making his charges in February 1950, that by refusing to “name names,” he was casting a cloud of suspicion over all State Department employees. Even though he enjoyed legislative immunity from libel charges while on the Senate floor and repeatedly stated that, “the vast majority of the State Department employees are loyal,” McCarthy only provided the names of a handful of the individuals he accused of subversion. One of them, Owen Lattimore, was never actually on the State Department payroll.¹ As Democratic Senator Scott Lucas observed, “the Senator from Wisconsin has done an injustice to members of

¹*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950) vol. 96, pt 2, 1953, 1959, 1964, 1969, 1972-4; William S. White, “Senator Makes Charges At Communist Hearing,” *New York Times* hereafter known as *NYT*, March 14, 1950, 1; William S. White, “Miss Kenyon Cites Patriotic Record To Refute Charges,” *NYT*, March 15, 1950, 1; William S. White, “State Department Recalls India Aide For Loyalty Check,” *NYT*, March 16, 1950, 1; William S. White, “F.B.I. Shows Data on Alleged Top Spy to Senate Inquiry,” *NYT*, March 25, 1950, 1; *NYT*, “Text of Letters on the Lattimore Issue,” April 30, 1950, 4; *NYT*, “M’Carthy Avoids Spy Charge in Talk Outside Congress,” April 9, 1950, 1; *NYT*, “M’Carthy Hiding, Lattimore Replies,” April 9, 1950, 44.

the State Department who are loyal and patriotic, and are attempting to carry on in the great world crisis in which we find ourselves.”²

Some in the press quickly noted that the vilification of the State Department had the potential for damaging the U.S. ability to conduct international relations. Calling McCarthy’s investigation absurd, a piece in the *New York Times* claimed that his wild accusations embarrassed the country and made it appear frivolous. More importantly, the *Times* asserted, it frayed the bipartisan unity on foreign relations and created an environment in which foreign policy could not be made calmly or intelligently.³

In July 1950, after the beginning of the Korean War, a *New York Post* editorial condemned McCarthy for moving the focus away from foreign affair and onto “futile” domestic battles. The author blasted McCarthy, writing:

If the Soviets had deliberately fashioned a diversion on American soil to cloak their military moves, the McCarthy madness would have been it. Nothing that has happened in Korea sustains the McCarthy principle that the crucifixion of a thousand Americans is defensible if one guilty man is ever found. The principle of the mass purge is the basis of Soviet, not American justice.⁴

A common liberal criticism of McCarthy, the writer charged him with employing Soviet tactics and aiding the enemies of the nation by indicting the State Department.

Democratic Senator Francis J. Myers of Pennsylvania called McCarthy “reckless” in May 1950. While Acheson was on official duty in Europe, McCarthy, speaking before the National Society of the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, demanded that President Truman fire Acheson and Ambassador at Large

²*Congressional Record* (February 20, 1950), 1981.

³*NYT*, “Abroad,” March 20, 1950, 20.

Phillip C. Jessup. His remark drew the retort from Senator Myers that the Senator was engaged in a, “deliberate and malicious attempt to undermine America’s leadership in foreign affairs.”⁵

George F. Kennan, a State Department employee and articulator of the strategy of containment, contributed to the public discourse on the affects of McCarthyism in May 1950. Speaking in Milwaukee, he warned that, “To blame the present state of our relations with the Soviet Union or Communist China on a few contemporary officials is an overly simple reading of history,” which “created an atmosphere in which it was difficult to explain policies or keep good men to administer foreign policy.” He asserted that the attacks on State Department officials jeopardized U.S. foreign policy.⁶

Kennan’s remarks prompted Harold H. Velde, the Republican Representative from Illinois who would later Chair the House Un-American Activities Committee, to enter into the Congressional Record an editorial that blamed the atmosphere of fear and suspicion on the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. The author claimed that McCarthy preferred, “to proceed quietly but learned that nothing could be accomplished that way.” The Democratic administrations had refused, according to the columnist, to

⁴*New York Post*, “Memo for Americans,” July 5, 1950, 5.

⁵*New York Post*, “McCarthy ‘Maliciously Tries to Undermine U.S.,’ Myers Says,” May 16, 1950, 2.

⁶James Reston, “Kennan Says Unfair Attacks Imperil U.S. Foreign Policy,” *New York Post*, May 9, 1950, 16; George F. Kennan, *Memoirs 1950-1963, Volume II* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1972), 222-3.

rid themselves of disloyal employees without the spectacle of McCarthy's "extreme methods." "Washington officialdom, therefore, must be blamed for the necessity for public accusations which make the lives of loyal Government officials miserable these days."⁷

In his memoirs, Kennan agreed that the Truman administration's failure to investigate fully the allegations against Alger Hiss increased public support for anti-communism. However, he contended that neither the congressional inquiries nor the trials provided the U.S. public with conclusive answers about even Hiss' communist connections, much less the extent of communist infiltration into the government.⁸ In addition to base partisanship, Kennan agreed with Edward Shils that McCarthyism appealed to populist anti-intellectualism and distrust of the "supposed effete and decadent East." He viewed the militant anti-communist forces as suspicious of cultural and social change, isolationist, and intolerant that narrowed the range of acceptable discourse in all areas of life. Speaking at the University of Notre Dame in 1953, Kennan warned that, "One has the impression that if uncountered, these people would eventually reduce the area of political and cultural respectability to a point where it included only themselves, the excited accusers, and excluded everything and everybody not embraced in the profession of denunciation."⁹

Kennan expressed the feelings of the Foreign Service Officers in a letter penned

⁷U.S. Congress, *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (18 May 1950) vol. 96, pt. 15, A3763.

⁸Kennan, *Memoirs*, 194-6.

⁹Kennan, *Memoirs*, 220-5; Edward Shils, *The Torment of Secrecy: The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies* (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1956), 13.

in October 1951:

If humiliation and rejection are to be the rewards of faithful and effective service in this field, what are those of us to conclude who have also served prominently in this line of work but upon whom this badge of honor has not yet been conferred? We cannot deceive ourselves into believing that it was merit, rather than chance, that spared some of us the necessity of working in areas of activity that have now become controversial, of recording opinions people now find disagreeable, of aiding in the implementation of policies now under question; for we know that not to be the case. We cannot comfort ourselves with the thought that a difference in casual personal associations of the remote past might justify this distinction, for we know that there could scarcely be a criterion less relevant, in itself, to the problem of a man's present fitness for service in the government.¹⁰

An editorial in the State Department Foreign Service Officers' monthly publication in April 1950 mirrored many of Kennan's sentiments. It commented on the low morale McCarthy's attacks had caused. Citing John S. Service as an example, the editorial warned other officers of the "reward" for speaking honestly and boldly against the popular opinion. However, "the temptation to shirk responsibility for difficult decisions[...]and to avoid giving expression to any opinion not in accord with the prevailing views of those above us[...]must be resisted."¹¹ Clearly, State Department officers felt their job security tenuous and feared they were likely to suffer reprisals for performing their jobs in a way that might offend someone in authority rather than for transgressing clearly defined work-related regulations.

Many State Department employees in the Foreign Service recall the McCarthy period as a difficult one. Dorothy Greene Johnson, who worked in the Cultural Centers Office, described the situation in the State Department, "we were beginning to move

¹⁰Kennan, *Memoirs*, 218-9.

¹¹White, "McCarthy Hiding, Lattimore Replies," April 9, 1950.

into this miasma of fear in 1947 that was to engulf the Department.”¹² Consul General Thomas W. Fina remembered the atmosphere as a “very difficult climate,” in which the Foreign Service employees “were all under the gun of McCarthyism,” and “we knew that McCarthyism was blowing down our necks.”¹³

For those in the Foreign Service, the situation deteriorated when Eisenhower took office in 1953 and appointed John Foster Dulles to the position of Secretary of State. One Foreign Service Officer remembered Dulles’ introductory speech to the State Department, in which he announced that he expected “positive loyalty” from all employees as “rather unbecoming” and “menacing” and that “it had a very negative impact on all of us, I think.” According to Fina, “in some respects it was a chilling experience after what we had known with Secretary Acheson.”¹⁴ Robert F. Woodward, who took the position of Chief of Foreign Service Personnel in 1952, stated that Dulles ordered that McCarthy be given “a free hand in the State Department to investigate anything he wants.” Further, State Department employees were unprepared for the tactics McCarthy and his assistants used including calling lower ranking employees to testify without any legal representation or advice and pursuing a strategy designed to make it impossible for the State Department to prove their allegations unfounded.¹⁵ The appointment of McCarthy’s supporters to positions of authority within the government,

¹²“Dorothy Greene Johnson,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren, (CD-ROM, 2000) (hereafter known as Frontline Diplomacy).

¹³ “Consul General Thomas W. Fina,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

¹⁴“Fina,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

¹⁵ “Robert F. Woodward,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

especially the State Department, decreased the agency's ability to defend against attacks.¹⁶

The response of the nation's leaders to McCarthyism fostered resentment among the Foreign Service. Kempton Jenkins faulted Truman for trying to bargain with McCarthy and Eisenhower who, Jenkins felt, had the prestige to discredit the Senator but instead campaigned for him in 1952.¹⁷ Robert Woodward echoed this opinion and remembered that Eisenhower and Dulles both lost esteem among the Foreign Service for "pandering" to McCarthy.¹⁸ Parke D. Massey, involved with labor relations, blamed the Washington press for failing to expose McCarthy's alcoholism and print allegations of homosexuality. He called the time "the most cowardly period in American history."¹⁹

Robert J. Ryan, the Assistant Chief of State Department Personnel during the McCarthy period, viewed McCarthyism as the result of deficiencies in the Department. Ryan acknowledged that a large number of employee files contained alarming charges that the Department had never investigated. In addition, many agencies created during the Second World War were incorporated into the State Department at the end of the war. These agencies contained employees, many of whom had never had a background check, who had questionable associations and even Communist Party memberships in their pasts. Only in the Eisenhower administration were full investigations made. Ryan

¹⁶“Kempton B. Jenkins,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

¹⁷“Jenkins,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

¹⁸“Robert F. Woodward,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

¹⁹“Parke D. Massey,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

regretted the “unfortunate case of some of the Foreign Service people who had been in the Far East” whom he described as “very able officers,” but he viewed their experiences of public disgrace and loss of career as resulting from the State Department’s own failure to investigate allegations and lay them to rest. However, he felt that McCarthyism had a serious effect on the reputation of the State Department and the morale of the employees.²⁰

However, the prevailing sentiment among the Foreign Service personnel was grief over the loss of colleagues. Robert Woodward recalled that, while they found no communists in the Department, investigations revealed some homosexuals and Woodward remembered that, “it was almost tragic that we lost their services because they were doing such able work.”²¹ Henry S. Villard, Minister to Tripoli from 1952-54, lost his most valuable officer because of allegations of homosexuality.²²

Concerns about homosexuality created opportunities for young, unmarried women. The State Department preferred to provide unmarried male employees with suitable companions with the objective of reducing security investigations.²³ Barbara J. Good, who recruited clerical staff for the Foreign Service, found that many of her homosexual male colleagues proved to be enjoyable companions not only because they treated her with respect but also because State Department regulations required that

²⁰“Robert J. Ryan,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

²¹“Robert Woodward,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

²²“Henry S. Villard,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

²³“Martha C. Mautner,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

women resign if they married. The purge of homosexuals from the Department diminished her social network.²⁴

L. Michael Rives not only lost a valued colleague to the Lavender Scare, but he was also accused of homosexuality. Because Rives was not married, the State Department Security personnel assumed he was homosexual, which both he and interviewer Charles Stuart Kennedy recalled as a common experience for unmarried men in the Foreign Service during the McCarthy period. Rives fought the charges. He was cleared because his accusers had no evidence of homosexuality and he continued in the Foreign Service into the 1980s.²⁵ But, while Rives weathered the accusation and retained his career, others did not.

Peter Szluk, the “hatchet man for the State Department” as he called himself, worked for the State Department in security from the late 1940s until 1962. He recalled that investigations usually began with an anonymous letter and “ninety-nine percent of the time, it [the accusation] was a bunch of crap.” “On his word,” employees were fired without hearings and “a pretty large percentage of them” were homosexuals. He claimed that “to this day, nobody knows who some of the people were that I got rid of because they were sodomites.” He would protect that information because “so many of them had families.” His only regret about his “campaign to rid the State Department of that type of individual” was when the terminated employee committed suicide. Szluk

²⁴“Barbara J. Good,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

²⁵“L. Michael Rives,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

remembered one man who shot and killed himself in front of the building immediately after Szluk fired him.²⁶

As late as the 1970s, State Department security relied on dubious evidence and questionable witnesses to detect homosexual employees. In one instance, a Foreign Service Officer was investigated after his secretary reported him as a homosexual. The secretary had a history of making unsubstantiated and extreme accusations. During the 1950s, while posted in Mexico, she had accused her boss of selling the bodies of deceased Americans back to their families for burial. Those allegations, investigated thoroughly by State Department Security, were found to be false. In the early 1970s, she again made accusations against a different Foreign Service Officer. This time, she claimed that he was a homosexual primarily because he wore a swimming cap when swimming. Although he was cleared of homosexuality, the investigation proved to be so damaging to him that he was never able to perform his job well again. The State Department later fired him due to low job performance and he experienced great difficulty finding other employment.²⁷

John Clemmons, an investigator for the Special Assignments Staff (SAS) in the 1970s, recalled the investigations of homosexuals. Although the SAS did not actively search for homosexuals in the State Department, they remained busy investigating allegations from many sources including the District of Columbia police force. The

²⁶“Peter Szluk,” oral history interview by Griffin Fariello, *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1995), 123-4.

²⁷“Charles A. Schmitz,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

interviews of accused employees sometimes lasted as long as three days and, although the employees were increasingly demanding legal counsel during these sessions, the Department denied their requests. Clemmons noted that during his tenure in that position, Congressman John J. Rooney, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, required an annual report on the number of homosexuals removed from the State Department before he would determine the department's budget, a practice that began when Dean Acheson occupied the position of Secretary of State.²⁸ After Clemmons left the SAS in 1974, the emphasis on finding homosexuals decreased which he felt was directly related to a decline in the number of State Department employee retirements.²⁹

While Peter Szluk may have concealed the homosexuality of some of the terminated employees, the State Department still reported an abundant number of homosexuals who no longer worked for the department. In the twenty year span covering the 1950s and 1960s, around 1,000 State Department employees lost their jobs because allegedly they were homosexuals. Between 1947 and 1951, 144 individuals left the agency because of homosexuality while only fourteen labeled as security risks departed. By 1953, 402 employees resigned or were fired for homosexuality in comparison to 252 who left because of loyalty or security issues.³⁰

²⁸Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 76.

²⁹“John Clemmons,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy and corroborated by Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett, “William J. Crockett,” oral history interview, Frontline Diplomacy.

³⁰Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 76. For more statistics regarding suspensions, resignations, and firing as a result of personnel security programs, which includes the State Department as well as other U.S. Government agencies, see The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, *Report of the*

In March 1952, *The Yale Law Journal* published a study by Psychologists Marie Jahoda and Stuart W. Cook that explored the effects of the loyalty and security program on employees. They conducted extensive interviews with fifteen faculty members from a variety of universities and seventy federal employees with the rank of junior professional and above from different governmental agencies. Two government employees who were approached for interviews refused on the grounds that participation might cause them professional problems. Although the interviewers attempted to maintain boundaries between loyalty and security measures and limit the study to official procedures, the respondents perceived them as parts of a larger program that linked official and unofficial actions, including Congressional speeches, House Un-American Activities Committee, the FBI's role in investigations, and even state and local programs. When discussing the security program, some respondents described it as "just like in Germany," and "Gestapo methods."³¹

Jahoda and Cook construed these reactions to indicate that security issues were quite significant to federal employees and permeated their environment, affecting both thought and behavior. Some employees reported concern with and adjustments in their reading habits, fear of signing petitions, and fear of joining organizations in case the actions might be deemed radical or subversive at a later date. Other employees reported

Special Committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1956), 219-226; Brown, *Loyalty and Security*, 487-497.

³¹Marie Jahoda and Stuart W. Cook, "Security Measures and Freedom of Thought: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Loyalty and Security Programs," *The Yale Law Journal* 61 (March 1952), 296, 303-4, 306.

a narrowing of perspectives in both professional and personal settings in a manner that reflected increased conformity with official policy. While federal employees reported positive relations with their coworkers, some respondents, especially those of higher rank, exhibited less confidence that their coworkers would be supportive, either by maintaining social contact or testifying on their behalf, if they should become the subject of the an investigation. They also felt that fear of Congressional investigations resulted in the appointment of only conservative individuals in an effort to avoid employees that might give Congress the ammunition to embarrass the agency. As one respondent stated, “I’m sure we’re losing many first-rate applicants this way. The people in charge of hiring are afraid of Congress.”³² All federal employees expressed awareness of the effect of security measures at least on others but most demonstrated the effect of the programs through changes in their own behavior, either willingly or grudgingly.³³ Jahoda and Cook’s findings suggest that the loyalty and security programs created a climate of anxiety that encouraged conformity to constricted ideals of action and behavior and shrank the potential pool of new employees.

Although Representative Hill claimed that there were “so many good Americans that we could employ” instead of homosexuals or communists, finding those “good Americans” who were willing to work for the U.S. government proved difficult.³⁴ The Truman administration had pursued a strategy of cutting employees from the federal

³²Jahoda and Cook, “Security Measures and Freedom of Thought,” 311, 314, 318-319, 323.

³³Jahoda and Cook, “Security Measures and Freedom of Thought,” 322-3.

³⁴ *Appendix to the Congressional Record* (March 28, 1950) v. 96, part 14, A2279.

payroll, but the Korean War caused an increased demand for government employees. While the government was hiring at the rate of 1,000 new employees per day, recruiters were having great difficulty filling positions. In the midst of a tight labor market, most of the civil service lists were depleted, which forced recruiters to scour university campuses looking for qualified applicants.³⁵

By early 1952, the press recognized that congressional investigations caused able government workers to find another employer. William S. White, writing for the *New York Times*, termed the period “the Age of Accusation and Era of Profound Ill-Feeling” in which the “high officials of the Government of the United States live in a kind of psychotic terror.” “Men in the State Department trim their reports, and their views, in fear of the present, or of another, Senator McCarthy,” while, he claimed, “the independent men, the strong-minded men, the courageous and go-to-hell men (many of whom have met a payroll and will again) are slowly in flight from a kind of world they do not know and do not wish to know.” In exchange for the perils of a government position, the federal employee received a salary that could be ten times lower than that paid for comparable work in the private sector.³⁶

College seniors who graduated in 1952 entered a labor market with plentiful jobs and fierce competition for workers. Private businesses were aggressively pursuing new employees, with every male graduate securing a position even before graduation at some universities. At the University of Virginia, seniors with non-technical majors

³⁵*NYT*, “‘Help Wanted’ Sign Out in Washington,” February 11, 1951, 142.

³⁶William S. White, “An Inquiry Into Congressional Inquiries,” *NYT*, March 23, 1952, SM11.

averaged six to ten job offers each while those with technical training averaged fifteen.³⁷ During the period, the federal workforce experienced forty percent turnover per year.³⁸

While the tight labor market and high wages in the private sector contributed to the difficulty of finding federal employees, the hazards of public life repelled top applicants even from high positions. Although Eisenhower experienced little trouble filling cabinet posts, many candidates for the second-in-command positions turned down offers of employment, forcing the president to ask as many as five different people to serve in some stations before he located a willing nominee. Unlike cabinet officers, those below them acquired much less prestige, power, or influence while being as exposed as their bosses to the stresses of public life. “An occupational risk” for employees in those positions was the “daily shower bath of mud flung by political scavengers, gossip columnists, and fanatics of every stripe” as well as the “official inquisition” that had devolved from the honest scrutiny of the nominee’s integrity and aptitude to “fishing for something that can be used for partisan advantage.”³⁹

The Public Committee on Personnel released a set of recommendations for reorganizing the State Department in June 1954. The report noted the low morale of the agency and stated, “precisely because diplomacy is so serious, urgent, and arduous, a high state of morale is essential to an effective Foreign Service.” Describing the State

³⁷Benjamin Fine, “Jobs Hunting Men On Campuses Now,” *NYT*, May 18, 1952, 57.

³⁸Clayton Knowless, “Problems Pile Up For Eisenhower,” *NYT*, November 10, 1952, 14.

³⁹Gerald W. Johnson, “Why Top Men Duck Washington,” *NYT*, May 3, 1953, SM19.

Department's Security program as "drastic and thorough," the committee affirmed that the program caused "uncertainties, doubts and fears." It further warned that "the tradition of frank and objective reporting that long has constituted the State Department's most enduring strengths" needed protection.⁴⁰

Two years into his presidency, Eisenhower found himself short of experienced diplomats. Secretary of State Dulles was scheduled to be out of the country for much of 1954 for the Berlin Conference, the Inter-American Conference in Venezuela, as well as for negotiations with the Soviet Union on atomic energy and disarmament. However, the president needed Dulles in the country as the Congress took up reviews of policy on Italy, Japan, and Korea, revision of the Atomic Energy Act, and debate over the Bricker Amendment and as conflict developed over trade policies and the budget for foreign initiatives. However, George Kennan, James Byrnes, Dean Rusk, Benjamin Cohen, and Bernard Baruch as well as many other able and experienced men were politically unattractive due to their past work for Democratic administrations. Additionally, many qualified men had positions in the private sector and there was "little competition for the thankless and infuriating task of negotiating with the Russians."⁴¹

Twice, in 1952 and 1955, the lack of candidates for government jobs was the topic of reports in *Editorial Research Reports*. While the pay scale was mentioned in both articles, other factors received attention. Among those factors was the decline in prestige of public service that resulted from Congressional investigations into scandals

⁴⁰Walter H. Waggoner, "Dulles Adopting New Staff Policy," *NYT*, June 16, 1954, 21.

⁴¹James Reston, "President's Dilemma," *NYT*, January 22, 1954, 6.

and immoral activity as well as the “indiscriminate hounding and smearing” of men attempting to do their job well. Additionally, the security issue strongly affected the morale, efficacy, and reputations of federal workers. It created an atmosphere of fear in which federal workers worried that the loyalty-security program could be used to fire employees for political reasons or that trivial or malicious charges could ruin the careers of loyal and trustworthy staff members.⁴²

Historian Robert Dean argues in *Imperial Brotherhood* that the Lavender Scare had lasting effects on the formulation of U.S. foreign relations. With the election of the Kennedy administration in 1960, many Eastern establishment bureaucrats returned to public service. They, as well as Lyndon Johnson, brought with them the memory of the Red and Lavender Scares and adopted an exaggerated masculinity in order to ward off accusations that they were “soft” on communism. The result, according to Dean, was that the United States continued to escalate the war in Vietnam even as the individual administration members harbored doubts about the advisability of the strategy they recommended and the nation’s failure in the region became obvious.⁴³

The effects of the Lavender Scare reached beyond the boundaries of the federal government. While the purge of homosexuals from the federal payroll wrecked some individuals’ lives and careers and drove others to suicide, it also united homosexuals.

⁴²Buel W. Patch, “Good Men for Government,” CQ Electronic Library, CQ Researcher Online, cqresrre1952110100, originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1952*, v. II (Washington: CQ Press, 1952); Martin Packman, “Government Jobs,” CQ Electronic Library, CQ Researcher Online, cqresrre1955051800, originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1955*, v. I (Washington: CQ Press, 1955).

⁴³Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*, 242-3.

Harry Hay, a Communist Party member, conceived the idea of an association for homosexual emancipation in 1948 when he came to the realization that homosexuals would be society's next scapegoat. That year, a friend introduced him to a State Department employee who told of the firings of homosexuals workers.⁴⁴

Hay originally proposed a group called "Bachelors for Wallace" that would campaign for Wallace in exchange for sexual privacy guarantees but could find no one willing to acknowledge their homosexual orientation publicly. Two years later, he found four other homosexuals with whom he set up the Mattachine Society in Los Angeles, an organization dedicated to advancing the position of the homosexual minority in the United States. While it was not the first association of its kind in the country, it was the first in a continuous succession of organizations dedicated to the liberation of the homosexual minority.⁴⁵

Hay had been aware of his sexual attraction for men as a prepubescent.⁴⁶ His first full sexual experience occurred at the age of fourteen and he had multiple sexual relationships throughout the 1930s.⁴⁷ At the urging of fellow actor and romantic partner, Will Geer, Hay became active in a group that enacted short political skits throughout the city of Los Angeles, eventually joined the communist party, and became

⁴⁴Stuart Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay: Founder of the Modern Gay Movement* (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1990), 132, 135-6; John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 58.

⁴⁵Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 132, 135-7, 144-6; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 58, 60, 62.

⁴⁶Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 22, 27-33; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 58.

⁴⁷Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 35-6, 62-64, 82-96.

a devoted member.⁴⁸ On the advice of a Jungian psychiatrist whom he visited while depressed over a romantic split and influenced by the communist party ban on homosexual acts, Hay married fellow party member Anita Platky in 1938.⁴⁹

When Hay started the Mattachine Society in 1950, both his marriage and his communist party membership ended.⁵⁰ However, the organizing skills that he, and other founding members of the Mattachine Society, learned as CP members proved valuable. Attracted by discussions on topics of concern to homosexuals, new members joined a hierarchical “cell” structure designed to protect the identities of the members. The members at the lower levels never knew of the existence, much less the identity, of the upper level membership.⁵¹ The concern for security and anonymity reflected both the experiences of many of the Mattachine’s founders as communist party members as well as the vulnerability of homosexuals during that period to oppression.⁵²

While the organization grew quickly and attracted a diverse membership, an exposé in a Los Angeles newspaper in 1953 provoked anxiety among the membership. The article highlighted the secrecy of the group and hinted at communist ties.⁵³ The membership called for more transparency and, in response, a convention was held

⁴⁸Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 67-70. Will Geer was the actor who played Grandpa Walton on the television program “The Waltons.”

⁴⁹Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 96-98, 104.

⁵⁰Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 157-160; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 60, 69-70.

⁵¹Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 151-2, 156; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 63-4.

⁵²D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 63.

⁵³Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 174-5; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 76.

during which the Mattachine Society was completely reorganized and new leadership was elected that promoted accommodation, firmly discarding the concept of homosexuals as a minority group. Although Hay relinquished control voluntarily, he did so because of his communist past just as he left the communist party because of his homosexuality.⁵⁴

Like Harry Hay, Frank Kameny started a chapter of the Mattachine Society in response to the U.S. Government's security program. Kameny had earned a Ph.D. in astronomy from Harvard in 1956 and, by the early 1960s, should have been in high demand due to the space program. However, because of a conviction for lewd conduct in 1956, he was fired from his job with the U.S. Army Map Service and he found that he could not get any job for which he was qualified.⁵⁵

Kameny challenged his dismissal through administrative channels and appealed to the executive branch as well as the Civil Service Committees of the House of Representatives and Senate, all to no avail. He then turned to the judicial branch. With the help of the national chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), Kameny secured an attorney and presented his case at the district and appeals courts. After losing at both levels, the lawyer removed himself from the case and Kameny prepared and filed the petition of *writ of certiorari* with the Supreme Court in January 1961. Kameny's personal case ended in March of the year when the Supreme Court

⁵⁴Timmons, *The Trouble with Harry Hay*, 176-9; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 76-81.

⁵⁵Franklin E. Kameny, "Government v. Gays: Two Sad Stories with Two Happy Endings," in *Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy, and Civil Rights*, ed. John D'Emilio, William B. Turner, and

refused to hear it. In the course of writing that writ, Kameny clarified his own opinions on gay rights that served as the basis for his future activism.⁵⁶

Franklin Kameny interpreted his dismissal from the Army Map Service as a “declaration of war” against himself and other homosexuals. Although he had only limited contact with homosexual organizations during the 1950s, Kameny turned his attention toward political organizing and founded the Mattachine Society of Washington (MSW) in November 1961. Beginning with only a small membership, the MSW reflected Kameny’s own views, was as on the front line of the Gay Liberation Movement, and targeted the anti-homosexual policies of the federal government.⁵⁷

Kameny and the MSW challenged the Civil Service Commission through the courts. With the help of the Washington branch of the ACLU, they achieved their first victory in 1965 with *Scott v. Macy I*.⁵⁸ *Norton v. Macy* in 1969 supplied a similar victory when the Appeals Court reiterated the opinion, first given in the Scott case, that the agency must “demonstrate some rational connection between ‘efficiency of the service,’ the underlying statutory criterion, and the conduct at issue.”⁵⁹ Court rulings in 1973 in *Baker and Rau v. Hampton* and *SIR and Hickerson v. Hampton*, cases in which

Urvashi Vaid (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 191; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 150.

⁵⁶Kameny, “Government v. Gays,” 191.

⁵⁷Kameny, “Government v. Gays,” 192; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 154; Henry L. Minton, *Departing from Deviance: A History of Homosexual Rights and Emancipatory Science in America* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 242-3.

⁵⁸Bruce C. Scott, the plaintiff, was a Department of Labor employee discharged because of homosexuality. The U.S. government appealed the case and lost in *Scott v. Macy II* (1968). Scott eventually returned to and retired from federal employment.

⁵⁹Clifford L. Norton was a NASA employee who was fired after he was arrested on “trumped up” solicitation charge.

Kameny had been closely involved, ended the formal exclusion of homosexuals from the Civil Service. Not all of the court cases that Kameny and the MSW took on were successful, but they did effectively force statutory change.⁶⁰

Like Hay, Kameny took the view that homosexuals were an oppressed minority. The strategies of Southern black leaders influenced him and he advocated direct action to change the discriminatory government security policies. Kameny wrote and disseminated position papers while the MSW engaged in letter writing campaigns directed to all branches of the government and the Civil Service Commission.⁶¹ Emulating Civil Rights groups' self-affirming slogans like "Black is Beautiful," Kameny coined the phrase "Gay is Good" as a means of challenging and counteracting the dominant society's hostile attitude toward homosexuals.⁶² The MSW also picketed the White House, Pentagon, Civil Service Commission, and Congress during the 1960s and these demonstrations not only gained press attention but also meetings with Selective Service chief General Lewis Hershey and Pentagon security officials.⁶³

While the country as a whole was moving toward greater tolerance in all areas and the legal support for denying employment to homosexuals was crumbling during the late 1960s and early 1970s, Kameny recognized that the psychiatric designation of

⁶⁰Kameny, "Government v. Gays," 191, 192, 193. The MSW's partnership with the ACLU is particularly noteworthy since the national parent organization had taken the position throughout the 1950s that the denial of employment to homosexuals was constitutional. It reinforced that position in relation to homosexual federal workers by relying on the psychiatric characterizations of homosexuals as diseased and unstable. D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 156.

⁶¹D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*, 154.

⁶²Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 242-3.

homosexuality as a disease remained an obstacle. The characterization of homosexuals as inherently unhappy, neurotic, unstable, and unreliable people easily justified the denial of employment to homosexuals. Kameny attacked the medical model of homosexuality dispensed by the psychiatric community in an article published in 1971 in *Psychiatric Opinion*. He asserted that the science behind the medical model of homosexuality was “shabby, shoddy, slipshod, slovenly, sleazy, and just-plain-bad science” based on the insufficient definitions of terms like pathology and neurosis, failure to follow scientific method or use proper sampling techniques, and weak logic.⁶⁴ Kameny wrote that, “medicine—and especially psychiatry—has a pathological psychological need for sexual hobgoblins. [...] Actually, it is not homosexuality that is pathological in this context, it is the entire discipline of psychiatry.”⁶⁵ He claimed that sociology, rather than psychiatry, was the correct discipline to address the situation of homosexuals since they were minorities like any others in American society.⁶⁶ Further, psychiatry’s treatment of homosexuals had been destructive to homosexuals’ psyches and contributed to the continuation of discrimination.⁶⁷

A point of great frustration to Kameny and many homosexuals was the habit of psychiatrists and other “experts” to talk about them rather than with them.⁶⁸ In 1970,

⁶³D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*; 154-5, Kameny, “Government v. Gays,” 199; *NYT*, “Homosexuals Stage Protest In Capital,” May 30, 1965, 42; Peter Bart, “War Role Sought For Homosexuals,” *NYT*, April 17, 1966, 12.

⁶⁴Franklin E. Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” in *The Homosexual Dialectic*, ed. Joseph A. McCaffrey (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc, 1972), 185-6, 187.

⁶⁵Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” 187.

⁶⁶Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” 188.

⁶⁷Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” 189.

⁶⁸Kameny, “Gay Liberation and Psychiatry,” 189-90; Minton, *Departing From Deviance*, 256.

the Gay Liberation Front began disrupting the professional conferences of the medical community that dealt with homosexuality.⁶⁹ Concerned that the entire American Psychiatric Association (APA) conference of 1971 would be disrupted and sympathetic to the protesters' demand for representation before the mental health community, Kent Robinson contacted Frank Kameny. Kameny set up a panel of six homosexuals, including himself and other leaders within the gay liberation movement. Kameny and the panel maintained a confrontational tone during the panel discussion while the conference attracted both gay liberation and anti-war protesters. During the 1971 conference, Robinson, at the behest of Kameny and Larry Littlejohn, a Gay Liberation Front activist, submitted a proposal to the APA to remove homosexuality from the *DSM-II*. However, the proposal failed to produce results.⁷⁰

The 1972 and 1973 APA conferences were characterized by less confrontation and more homosexual participation. Within the APA, the Gay-PA consisted of closeted homosexual psychiatrists and in 1972, Dr. Anonymous, a homosexual psychiatrist appeared on a panel in disguise. More significant, a group of dissident psychiatrists challenged the traditional perspective and a professional debate ensued.⁷¹ As the topic of a panel discussion at the 1973 conference, the issue of removing homosexuality from the psychiatric diagnostic classification drew an audience of nearly one thousand. After

⁶⁹The Gay Liberation Front was founded a few weeks after the Stonewall Riot in 1969, was influenced by the New Left, and was radical and aggressive. Minton, *Departing From Deviance*, 255-6.

⁷⁰Minton, *Departing From Deviance*, 256-7.

⁷¹The debate over homosexuality in the mental health community was not only internal but also spilled over into the media. For one example, see *NYT*, "The Changing View of Homosexuality," February 28, 1971, 47.

Robert Spitzer, a member of the APA's Committee on Nomenclature, organized and chaired that discussion, he drew up a proposal to delete homosexuality from the *DSM-II*. In a compromise to those psychiatrists who viewed homosexuality as a less desirable means of functioning than heterosexuality, he devised a new category, sexual orientation disturbance. In December 1973, the APA board of trustees approved the proposal thirteen to zero with two abstentions. The Board similarly approved a statement opposing discrimination against homosexuals.⁷²

However, as Kameny notes, even after these hard fought victories, homosexual federal employees remained fearful and many opted to remain closeted until the early 1990s. For those positions that required a security clearance, homosexuals often had a longer, more intrusive experience than heterosexuals although most were ultimately cleared. In the early 1990s, Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Employees of the Federal Government (GLOBE) formed that offered support for openly gay employees and sensitivity training for fight homophobia. The Clinton administration not only appointed homosexuals to high-level positions but also encouraged executive agencies to discourage discrimination against homosexuals.⁷³

The Lavender Scare had long-term and far-reaching effects on the performance of the State Department and the formation of U.S. foreign policy. It affected many federal workers on a personal level, damaging many individuals. However, the extreme

⁷²Minton, *Departing From Deviance*, 258-261. Sexual orientation disturbance was removed from the diagnostic classification in 1986.

⁷³Kameny, "Government v. Gays," 194-5, 202-3.

discrimination against homosexuals provoked them to challenge the views and policies that oppressed them.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The sex crime panic of the postwar years produced the narrative of the sexual psychopath but not because of an increase in sexual crimes. As increasing numbers of women entered the workforce throughout the late 1940s and 1950s, tales of rampant sexual psychopaths bolstered men's roles as protectors and undermined women's independence. Similarly, the perceived threat that sexual psychopaths posed to children sent the message to mothers that they should stay home. During the same period, "experts" recommended that families abandon the traditional authoritarian attitudes and adopt a more democratic structure. In addition, the heightened visibility of homosexuals who migrated to large cities and formed communities during the 1940s as well as the publication of the Kinsey Reports in 1948 and 1953 brought "deviant" sexual practices to the attention of a broad range of Americans and into the public forum. A nation in conflict over issues of gender, family dynamics, and sexual behavior seized upon the image of the sexual psychopath. Action against the sexual psychopath substituted for action against social change.

Similarly, the United States concluded the Second World War as one of two superpowers. As tensions with the Soviet Union escalated, the former ally became the enemy and narratives about the evils of communists became common in the American print media. These portrayals often related a simplistic version of a complex reality, as

illustrated by articles about abducted Greek children. However, these representations functioned to communicate the key premises of foreign policy to the U.S. public. In addition, these narratives also served to mobilize public opinion behind major foreign relations initiatives of the early Cold War period such as the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Korean War.

In the U.S. press, narratives about communists and sexual psychopaths, especially homosexuals, were remarkably similar. The individuals of both groups targeted children, were cliquish and “twisted,” and sometimes used violence to achieve their goals. To the average American, communism was not a legitimate political affiliation; a communist was a type of person—one who had forfeited his allegiance to the United States and given his personal will to the communist party. Similarly, homosexuality was not a legitimate sexual preference; a homosexual was a type of person—one who had no control over his or her sexual desires and conduct. While communists aspired to destroy the political order of the country, homosexuals aspired to disrupt the social order of the country. To the U.S. public, communists and homosexuals were equal in status and objective, they reinforced one another, and they elicited equivalent responses.

Just as the Cold War and the communist narrative set the stage for the Red Scare, so too did the sex crime panic, and the sexual psychopath narrative set the stage for the Lavender Scare. Moreover, since these two narratives mirrored one another, easily merged, and reinforced one another, the two “Scares” were often intertwined, as illustrated by accusations of homosexuals and communists in the employ of the State

Department. However, while the purges of communists and homosexuals were originally linked, the persecution of homosexuals lasted long after the concern with communists faded.

Although it has received less publicity than the Red Scare, more federal government employees lost their jobs because of the Lavender Scare. The purge of homosexuals from the State Department had a long-term effect on the performance of the agency and the formation of U.S. foreign policy, prompting some policymakers to adopt an exaggeratedly masculine persona in order to fend off accusations of being “soft” on communism. In addition, the persecution of homosexuals in the State Department left many individuals damaged and devastated.

However, the Lavender Scare also provoked early leaders of the homosexual movement to challenge and change the policies that oppressed them. Harry Hay began the Mattachine Society in 1950 as a direct response to the Lavender Scare. Although the Mattachine Society was not the first homosexual association in the United States, it was the first in an uninterrupted series of organizations created for the purpose of homosexual liberation. Similarly, Franklin Kameny, himself a victim of the Lavender Scare, emerged as a leader in the fight against federal policies aimed at homosexuals. In addition, he worked with other gay liberation organizers to challenge the American Psychiatric Association’s classification of homosexuals as “diseased,” finally succeeding in 1973. While the Lavender Scare had a negative effect on the State Department and many individuals, it ultimately served as a catalyst that produced

homosexual leaders who challenged the narratives on which the intense discrimination was based.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Oral Histories

- Clemmons, John. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Clifford, Clark M. oral history interview. Truman Presidential Library, www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/cliford.htm
- Crockett, William J. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Fina, Consul General Thomas W. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Good, Barbara J. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Jenkins, Kempton B. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Johnson, Dorothy Greene. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Massey, Parke D. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.

- Matusow, Harvey Job. oral history interview by Griffin Fariello. *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995.
- Maunter, Martha C. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Rives, L. Michael. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Ryan, Robert J. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Schmitz, Charles A. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Szluk, Peter. oral history interview by Griffin Fariello. *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition, An Oral History*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1995.
- Villard, Henry S. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.
- Woodward, Robert F. oral history interview. Frontline Diplomacy: U.S. Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection, ed. Marilyn Bentley and Marie Warren. CD-ROM, 2000.

Unpublished U.S. Government Documents

- Records of the State Department, Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 3-2348, Record Group 59, National Archives Building, College Park, Maryland.
- Records of the State Department, Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 4-348, Record Group 59, National Archives Building, College Park, Maryland.
- Records of the State Department, Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 4-448, Record Group 59, National Archives Building, College Park, Maryland.

Published U.S. Government Documents

CNN Cold War. "Truman Doctrine Speech."

<http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/03/documents/truman/>.

United States Congress. *Appendix to the Congressional Record*. 81st Congress, 2nd Session.

_____. "Executive Sessions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee." 83rd Congress, 1953.

_____. *Appendix to the Congressional Record*. 82nd Congress, 2nd Session.

_____. Subcommittee of the Committees on the Judiciary. *Revision of Immigration, Naturlization, and Nationality Laws: Joint Hearings Before the Subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary*. 82nd Congress, 1st Session. March 15, 1951.

_____. *The Congressional Record*. 81st Congress, 2nd Session.

United States Senate. "Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government." Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1949.

_____. "Revision of Immigration, Naturalization, and Nationality Laws." Report 1137, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session. January 10, 1952.

Contemporary Periodicals, Newspapers

Better Homes and Gardens

Collier's

Coronet

Dallas Morning News

New York Post

New York Times

Newsweek

Parents' Magazine

Saturday Evening Post

Science Digest

Science News Letter

The American City

The American Magazine
The American Mercury
Time
Washington Post

Other Cited Sources: Primary and Secondary

Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. NY: W.W. Norton, Inc., 1969.

Bærentzen, Lars. "The 'Paidomazoma' and the Queen's Camps." In *Studies in the History of the Greek Civil War, 1945-1949*. ed. Lars Bærentzen, John O. Iatrides, and Ole L. Smith, 127-158. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1987.

Ball, George. *The Past Has Another Pattern*. NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1982.

Bensing, Robert C. "A Comparative Study of American Sex Statutes." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (May – June 1951), 57-72.

Beyer, Gunther. "The Political Refugee: 35 Years Later." *International Migration Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1/2 (Spring – Summer 1981), 26-34.

Bill, James A. *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Black, C.E. "Greece and the United Nations." *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 63, No. 4 (December 1948), 551-568.

Boeschoten, Riki van. "Impossible Return: Coping With Separation and the Reconstruction of Memory in the Wake of the Civil War." in *After the Civil War Was Over: Reconstructing the Family, Nation, and State in Greece, 1943-1960*. ed. By Mark Mazower, 122-141. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Bontecou, Eleanor. *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1953.

Brown, Ralph S. Jr. *Loyalty and Security: Employment Tests in the United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

- C.P. Rodocanachi. *Against and For the Greek Child*. Athens: Ministry for Press and Information, 1948.
- Canaday, Margot. "Who is a Homosexual?: The Consolidation of Sexual Identities in Mid-Twentieth Century American Immigration Law." *Law and Social Inquiry*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (2003), 351-386.
- Caute, David. *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower*. NY: Simon and Schuster, 1978.
- Chauncey, George Jr. "The Postwar Sex Crime Panic," in *True Stories from the American Past*, ed., William Graebner, 160-78. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1993.
- Cohn, Carol. "Wars, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War." in *Gendering Wartalk*. ed. By Miriam Cooke and Angela Woolacott, 227-246. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Costigliola, Frank. "The Nuclear Family: Tropes of Gender and Pathology in the Western Alliance." *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Spring 1997), 163-183.
- Crispell, Brian Lewis. *Testing the Limits: George Armistead Smathers and Cold War America*. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1999.
- Cuordileone, K.A. *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War*. NY: Routledge, 2005.
- D'Emilio, John and Estelle B. Freedman. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Harper & Row. Publishers, 1988.
- D'Emilio, John. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Dean, Robert D. *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara and Deirdre English. *For Her Own Good: Two Centuries of the Experts' Advice to Women*. New York; Anchor Books, 1978.

- Ehrenreich, Barbara. *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1983.
- Engelstein, Laura. "Soviet Policy Toward Male Homosexuality: Its Origins and Historical Roots." *Journal of Homosexuality*, Vol. 29, No. 2/3 (1995), 155-173.
- Filene, Peter G. *Him/Her/Self: Gender Identities in Modern America*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Freedman, Estelle B. "Uncontrolled Desires: The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960." *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 74, No. 1. (June, 1987), 83-106.
- Fried, Richard M. "Electoral Politics and McCarthyism: the 1950 Campaign." In *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis, 190-222. NY: New Viewpoints, 1974.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy During the Cold War*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gerolymatos, André. *Red Acropolis, Black Terror: The Greek Civil War and the Origins of the Soviet-American Rivalry, 1943-1949*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.
- Guttmacher, Manfred and Weihofen. "Sex Offenses." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (July – August 1952), 153-175.
- Hartman, Susan M. "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years." in *Not June Cleaver*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz, 84-102. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Jahoda, Marie and Stuart W. Cook. "Security Measures and Freedom of Thought: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Loyalty and Security Programs." *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (March 1952), 295-333.
- Jeffords, Susan. *The Remasculinization of America: Gender and the Vietnam War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

- Jenkins, Philip. *Moral Panic: Changing Concepts of the Child Molester In Modern America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Johnson, David K. *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Johnson, Walter, Carol Evans, and C. Eric Sears, ed. *The Papers of Adlai E. Stevenson, Volume IV, "Let's Talk Some Sense to the American People" 1952-1955*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974.
- Jones, Howard. "The Diplomacy of Restraint: The United States' Effort to Repatriate Greek Children Evacuated During the Civil War of 1946-49." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 1 (May 1985), 65-85.
- Kameny, Franklin E. "Gay Liberation and Psychiatry." in *The Homosexual Dialectic*, ed. Joseph A. McCaffrey, 182-94. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1972.
- _____. "Government v. Gays: Two Sad Stories with Two Happy Endings." In *Creating Change: Sexuality, Public Policy, and Civil Rights*, ed. John D'Emilio, William B. Turner, and Urvashi Vaid, 188-207. NY: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Karakasidou, Anastasia N. *Fields of Wheat, Hills of Blood: Passages to Nationhood in Greek Macedonia, 1870-1990*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Kennan, George F. *Memoirs 1950-1963, Volume II*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1972.
- Koliopolis, John S. *Plundered Loyalties: World War II and Civil War in Greek West Macedonia*. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Lait, Jack and Lee Mortimer. *Washington Confidential*. NY: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1951.
- Leffler, Melvyn. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Specter of Communism: The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1953*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

- Loewenberg, Richard D., M.D. "The Sexual Psychopath: A Symposium." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 43, No. 5 (January – February 1953), 592-621.
- Lora, Ronald and William Henry Longton, ed. *The Conservative Press In Twentieth-Century America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Marantzidis, Nikos and Giorgos Antoniou. "The Axis Occupation and Civil War: Changing Trends in Greek Historiography, 1941-2002." *The Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2004), 223-231.
- Markowitz, Norman. "A View from the Left: From the Popular Front to Cold War Liberalism." in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*, ed. Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis, 90-115. NY: New Viewpoints, 1974.
- May, Elaine Tyler. *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1988.
- Mazower, Mark. "Review: Historians at War: Greece, 1940-1950." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (June 1995), 499-506.
- Mihm, Ferd Paul. "A Re-Examination of the Validity of Our Sex Psychopath Statutes in the Light of Recent Appeal Cases and Experience." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 44, No. 6 (March – April 1954), 716-736.
- Minton, Henry L. *Departing From Deviance: A History of Homosexual Rights and Emancipatory Science in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Nachmani, Amikam. "Civil War and Foreign Intervention in Greece, 1946-49." *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (October 1990), 489-522.
- Nickle, R.K. "Control of Sex Offenses." CQ Electronic Library, CQ Online, cqresre1949121500. Originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1949*, vol. II. Washington: CQ Press, 1949.
- Nourie, Alan and Barbara Nourie, ed. *American Mass-Market Magazines*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

- Packman, Martin. "Government Jobs." CQ Electronic Library, CQ Researcher Online, cqresrre1955051800. originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1955*, vol. I. Washington: CQ Press, 1955.
- Patch, Buel. "Good Men for Government." CQ Electronic Library. CQ Researcher Online, cqresrre1952110100. originally published in *Editorial Research Reports 1952*, vol. II. Washington: CQ Press, 1952.
- [Red Cross]. UN. General Assembly (6th sess. : 1951-1952 : Paris). 1952. Repatriation of Greek Children. *A/2119 (GAOR, 6th Sess., Suppl. No. 20)*. - 1952.
- Reinhardt, James M. and Edward C. Fisher. "The Sexual Psychopath and the Law." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* Vol. 39, No. 6 (March – April 1949), 734-42.
- Resis, Albert. "The Churchill-Stalin Secret 'Percentages' Agreement on the Balkans, Moscow, October 1944." *The American History Review*, Vol. 83, No. 2 (April 1978), 368-387.
- Reuman, Miriam G. *American Sexual Character: Sex, Gender, and National Identity in the Kinsey Report*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Royal Greek Embassy. *Iron Curtain Holds Greek Children Captive: A Survey of the Case of the Kidnapped Greek Children*. Washington: Royal Greek Embassy Information Service, 1950.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The Vital Center*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949.
- Scott, Joan. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 5 (December 1986), 1053-1075.
- Shils, Edward. *The Torment of Secrecy: The Background and Consequences of American Security Policies*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1956.
- Sutherland, Edwin. "The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws." *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 56, No. 2 (September 1950), 142-8.
- _____. "The Sexual Psychopath Laws." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 40, No. 5 (January – February 1950), 534-554.

- Swanson, Alan H. "Sexual Psychopath Statutes: Summary and Analysis." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (July – August 1960), 215-235.
- Tanner, William R. and Robert Griffith. "Legislative Politics and 'McCarthyism': The Internal Security Act of 1950." in the *The Specter: Original Essays on the Cold War and the Origins of McCarthyism*. ed. By Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis, 172-189. New York: New Viewpoints, 1974.
- Tappan, Paul W. "Sentences for Sex Criminals." *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (September-October 1951), 332-337.
- The Association of the Bar of the City of New York. *Report of the Special Committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security Program of the Association of the Bar*. NY: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1956.
- Theoharis, Athan. *The Truman Presidency: The Origins of the Imperial Presidency and the National Security State*. Stanfordville, NY: Earl M. Coleman Enterprises, Inc., 1979.
- Timmons, Stuart. *The Trouble with Harry Hay: Founder of the Modern Gay Movement*. Boston: Alyson Publications, 1990.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement 1945-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Trexler, Richard C. *Sex and Conquest: Gender Violence, Political Order, and the European Conquest of the Americas*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- United Nations. *Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*. Lake Success, New York: United Nations, 1948.
- _____. *Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*. Lake Success, N.Y.: United Nations, 1949.
- _____. *Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*. Lake Success, N.Y.: United Nations, 1950.
- _____. *Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*. Lake Success, N.Y.: United Nations, 1951.

- _____. *Supplementary Report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans*. Paris: United Nations, 1948.
- Voglis, Polymeris. *Becoming a Subject: Political Prisoners During the Greek Civil War*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2002.
- Voutira, Eftihia and Aiglia Brouskou. "Borrowed Children in the Greek Civil War." in *Abandoned Children*. ed. By Catherine Panter-Brick and Malcolm T. Smith, 92-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Weinstein, Allen. *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Weiss, Jessica. *To Have and To Hold, The Baby Boom and Social Change*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Wheeler, Stanton. "Sex Offenses: A Sociological Critique." *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Spring 1960), 258-278.
- White, G. Edward. *Alger Hiss's Looking Glass Wars: The Covert Life of a Soviet Spy*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Wiecek, William M. "The Legal Foundations of Domestic Anticommunism: The Background of Smith v. United States." *The Supreme Court Review*, no vol. # (2001), 375-434.
- Wittner, Lawrence S. *American Intervention in Greece, 1943-1949*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Wylie, Philip. *Generation of Vipers*, new annotated edition. NY: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1955.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Holly S. Heatley lives in Fort Worth, Texas with her very intelligent, energetic, and beautiful daughter, Sophia. She completed a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology in May 2004 and plans to pursue a Ph.D. after a short hiatus.